ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 06306 0146

GC
973.006
M69,
1918-1919

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

Board of Editors

SOLON J. BUCK
LAWRENCE J. BURPEE
WALTER L. FLEMING
DAN E. CLARK
ISAAC J. COX
MILO M. QUAIFE
ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT
JAMES A. JAMES

Managing Editor

CLARENCE W. ALVORD

VOLUME V
June, 1918, to March, 1919

Published quarterly by the Mississippi Valley Historical Association

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012

http://archive.org/details/mississippivalle00miss

88189

CONTENTS OF VOLUME V

NUMBER 1. JUNE, 1918

ARTICLES

POPULISM IN LOUISIANA DURING THE NINETIES. Melvin J. White . 3

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN. Eugene C. Barker 20

TERRITORIAL LEGISLATION BY GOVERNOR AND JUDGES. William L. Jenks 36

HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN THE OLD NORTHWEST. Arthur C. Cole . 51

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A RECONSIDERATION OF GOLD DISCOVERIES IN THE NORTHWEST . . 70

BOOK REVIEWS 78

NEWS AND COMMENTS 113

NUMBER 2. SEPTEMBER, 1918

ARTICLES

THE FIRST RAILROAD BETWEEN THE MISSISSIPPI AND LAKE SUPERIOR. Lester B. Shippee 121

THE LITERARY SPIRIT AMONG THE EARLY OHIO VALLEY SETTLERS. Logan Esarey 143

THE LOST COMMISSION: A STUDY IN MISSISSIPPI HISTORY. James E. Winston 158

HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN CANADA, 1917-1918. James F. Kenney . 190

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

THE MECKLENBURG DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE . . . 207

BOOK REVIEWS 216

NEWS AND COMMENTS 244

NUMBER 3. DECEMBER, 1918

ARTICLES

ANDREW JOHNSON AND THE EARLY PHASES OF THE HOMESTEAD BILL. St. George L. Sioussat 253

THE PASSING OF THE FRONTIER. Arthur C. Cole 288

TRADE IN THE BLUE-GRASS REGION, 1810-1820. Theodore G. Gronert 313

THE NORTHERN RAILROADS AND THE CIVIL WAR. Hermon K. Murphey 324

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

THE ORIGIN OF THE NAME OF THE CREEK INDIANS 339

A LETTER FROM NEW MADRID 342

BOOK REVIEWS 347
NEWS AND COMMENTS 371

NUMBER 4. MARCH, 1919

ARTICLES

COMMERCIAL INTERCOURSE WITH THE CONFEDERACY IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY, 1861-1865. E. Merton Coulter . . . 377

EARLY AGITATION FOR A PACIFIC RAILROAD, 1845-1850. Robert S. Cotterill 396

SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE EARLY TARIFFS. John L. Conger . . 415

RELIGIOUS FORCES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1815-1830. Martha L. EDWARDS 436

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

LETTERS OF JOHN BALL 450

BOOK REVIEWS 469

NEWS AND COMMENTS 504

INDEX

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME V

"Abraham Lincoln," by C. P. Bissett, reviewed, 91-92.

"Abraham Lincoln, Latest light on, and wartime memories," by E. Chapman, reviewed, 348.

Activities in Canada, 1917-1918, Historical, by J. F. Kenney, 190-206.

Activities, in the old northwest, Historical, by A. C. Cole, 51-69.

"Adams, Writings of John Quincy," by W. C. Ford, reviewed, 220-222.

ALVORD, CLARENCE W., (R) Burton's "Manuscripts from the Burton historical collection," 222-223; (R) Scott's "President Wilson's foreign policy: messages, addresses, papers," 347.

ALVORD, IDRESS H., (R) Lippincott's "Early Philadelphia, its people, life and progress," 93-97; (R) Smith's "Dwelling houses of Charleston, South Carolina," 93-97; (R) Stanard's "Colonial Virginia, its people and customs," 93-97; (R) Wood's "Historic Mackinac," 364.

AMBLER, CHARLES H., (R) Hamilton's "Life of Robert E. Lee," 370.

"American ethnology, Thirty-first annual report of the bureau of," reviewed, 475.

"American Indian," by C. Wissler, reviewed, 352-354.

"American negro slavery," by U. B. Phillips, reviewed, 480-482.

"American people, History of the," by C. A. Beard and W. C. Bagley, reviewed, 473-474.

"American plan of government," by C. W. Bacon, reviewed, 85-87.

"American spirit," by P. Monroe and I. E. Miller, reviewed, 474.

Andrew Johnson and the early phases of the homestead bill, by St. G. L. Sioussat, 253-287; conflicting points of view on public land question, 253-255; Henry Clay's plan, 256; Calhoun's plan, 256; Benton's plan, 256-258; the graduation bill, 258-261; origin of homestead idea, 262-263; Austin's land system in Texas, 264; opposition to sale of lands, 266-269; political beginnings of Andrew Johnson, 270-273; Johnson's career in congress, 273-276; his homestead bill, 277-287.

ANDERSON, FRANK M., (R) Hanscom's "Heart of the Puritan," 220.

"Anti-slavery movement in Kentucky prior to 1850," by A. E. Martin, reviewed, 361-363.

"Arizona, History of," by T. E. Farish, reviewed, 109-110.

Austin, Stephen F., by E. C. Barker, 20-35.

"Audubon the naturalist," by F. H. Herrick, reviewed, 226-228.

"Back from hell," by S. C. Benson, reviewed, 503.

Bacon, Charles W., "American plan of government," reviewed, 85-87.

Bagley, William C. and C. A. Beard, "History of the American people," reviewed, 473-474.

Ball, John, Letters of (doc.), by M. M. Quaife, 450-468.

BARKER, EUGENE C., (R) Farish's "History of Arizona," 109-110; (R) Sabin's "With Sam Houston in Texas," 108-109; *Stephen F. Austin*, 20-35.

"Battle of Plattsburg: a study in and of the war of 1812," by J. M. Stahl, reviewed, 485-487.

Beard, Charles A. and W. C. Bagley, "History of the American people," reviewed, 473-474.

"Belgium, Journal from our legation in," by H. Gibson, reviewed, 78-79.

Bell, F. McKelvey, "First Canadians in France," reviewed, 240.

Benson, Samuel C., "Back from hell," reviewed, 503.

BENTON, ELBERT J. (R) Ryan's "Ohio in four wars," 229.

"Bingham, the Missouri artist, George Caleb," by F. H. Rusk, reviewed, 225-226.

Bissett, Clark P., "Abraham Lincoln," reviewed, 91-92.
Blue-grass region, 1810-1820, Trade in the, by T. G. Gronert, 313-323.
BOGART, ERNEST L., (R) Commons and associates' "History of labour in the United States," 477-479; (R) Lutz's "State tax commission," 217-218; (R) MacGill's "History of transportation in the United States before 1860," 89-90.
BOND, B. W., Jr., (R) Pollock's "History of economic legislation in Iowa," 494-496.
BONHAM, MILLEDGE L., JR., (R) Lonn's "Reconstruction in Louisiana after 1868," 366-368.
BRIGHAM, JOHNSON, (R) "Report of the librarian of congress and report of the superintendent of the library building and grounds," 349-351.
Brooks, Eugene C., "Story of corn and the western migration," reviewed, 90-91.
BROOKS, R. P., (R) McCain's "Georgia as a proprietary province," 101-102.
BROWN, EVERETT S., (R) Putnam's "California: the name," 237-238; (R) Rowland's "Official letter books of W. C. C. Claiborne, 1801-1816," 102-105.
Bryan, George S., "Sam Houston," reviewed, 369.
"Bureau of American ethnology, Thirty-first annual report of the," reviewed, 475.
Burton, C. M., "Manuscripts from the Burton historical collection," reviewed, 222-223.
"Burton historical collection, Manuscripts from the," by C. M. Burton, reviewed, 222-223.
Calhoun, Arthur W., "Social history of the American family," reviewed, 87-89.
"California: the name," by Ruth Putnam, reviewed, 237-238.
Canada, 1917-1918, Historical activities in, by J. F. Kenney, 190-206.
CARTER, C. E., (R) Cox's "West Florida controversy, 1798-1913," 488-490.
"Casas, Las," by A. J. Knight, reviewed, 471.
Chapman, Erwin, "Latest light on Abraham Lincoln and wartime memories," reviewed, 348.
"Charleston, South Carolina, Dwelling houses of," by A. R. and D. E. Huger Smith, reviewed, 93-97.
"Chronicles of Pennsylvania," by C. P. Keith, reviewed, 358.
Civil war, Northern railroads and the, by H. K. Murphey, 324-338.
"Claiborne, 1801-1816, Official letter books of W. C. C.," by D. Rowland, reviewed, 102-105.
Clark, John S., "Life and letters of John Fiske," reviewed, 222.
COLE, ARTHUR C., (R) Chapman's "Latest light on Abraham Lincoln and wartime memories," 348; *Historical activities in the old northwest*, 51-69; (R) Johnson's "Illinois in the fifties," 107-108; (R) Levy's "Lincoln, the politician," 482; *Passing of the frontier*, 288-312.
"Colonial Virginia, its people and customs," by M. N. Stanard, reviewed, 93-97.
Commercial intercourse with the confederacy in the Mississippi valley, 1861-1865, by E. M. Coulter, 377-395; economic difficulties raised by secession, 377-378; permit system, 379-382; trade in invaded regions, 382-383; Mississippi river trade, 383; treasury regulations, 384-385; large volume of trade, 385-387; trade beyond military lines, 387-390; effect on business morals, 391; effect on military operations, 391-393; policy of treasury, 393-394.
Commission: a study in Mississippi history, Lost, by J. E. Winston, 158-189.
Commons, John R. and associates, "History of labour in the United States," reviewed, 477-479.
"Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," by T. K. Smith, reviewed, 357.
"Compensation and insurance, Workmen's," by D. H. Van Doren, reviewed, 479.
Confederacy, Commercial intercourse with in the Mississippi valley, 1861-1865, by E. M. Coulter, 377-395.
"Confedration, Ohio in the time of the," by A. B. Hulbert, reviewed, 490-492.
CONGER, JOHN L., *South Carolina and the early tariffs*, 415-433.
"Constitutions, State, and the federal constitution and organic laws of the territories and other colonial dependencies of the United States of America," by C. Kettleborough, reviewed, 476-477.
"Controversy over neutral rights between the United States and France, 1797-1800," by J. B. Scott, reviewed, 216-217.
"Corn and the western migration, Story of," by E. C. Brooks, reviewed, 90-91.
COTTERILL, ROBERT S., *Early agitation for a Pacific railroad, 1845-1850*, 396-414.
COULTER, E. MERTON, *Commercial intercourse with the confederacy in the Mississippi valley, 1861-1865*, 377-395.

Cox, Isaac J., "West Florida controversy, 1798-1813," reviewed, 488-490.
CRANE, VERNER W., *Origin of the name of the Creek Indians* (doc.), 337-342.
Creek Indians, Origin of the name of the (doc.), by V. W. Crane, 337-342.
"Cruise of the Corwin," by John Muir, reviewed, 110-112.
CUNNINGHAM, CHARLES H., (R) Zahm's "Quest of El Dorado," 83-85.
"Customs, Colonial Virginia, its people and," by M. N. Stanard, reviewed, 93-97.
Davenport, Frances G., "European treaties bearing on the history of the United States and its dependencies to 1648," reviewed, 469-470.
"Delaware district before the revolution, Trade of the," by M. A. Hanna, reviewed, 97-98.
"Development of Japan," by K. S. Latourette, reviewed, 471-472.
"Development of the British West Indies, 1700-1763," by F. W. Pitman, reviewed, 238-240.
"Diary of a nation," by E. S. Martin, reviewed, 79.
"Diplomacy, Dramatic moments in American," by R. W. Page, reviewed, 471.
"Dragoons in the Mississippi valley, Marches of the," by L. Pelzer, reviewed, 230-231.
"Dramatic moments in American diplomacy," by R. W. Page, reviewed, 471.
DUNN, J. P., (R) "Thirty-first annual report of the bureau of American ethnology," 475.
Dunn, William E., "Spanish and French rivalry in the gulf region of the United States, 1678-1702," reviewed, 501-503.
"Dwelling houses of Charleston, South Carolina," by Alice R. and D. E. Huger Smith, reviewed, 93-97.
Early agitation for a Pacific railroad, 1845-1850, by R. S. Cotterill, 396-414; Whitney's first memorial for a Pacific road, 396-398; public opinion on scheme, 398-399; Whitney's exploration of route, 399; second memorial, 400-402; public opinion, 403; agitation for a southern route, 403; the Maury plan, 404; Whitney's third memorial, 405-407; conflict of routes, 407-411; the railroad conventions, 411-412; impracticality of idea, 413-414.
"Early diplomatic relations between the United States and Japan, 1853-1865," by P. J. Treat, reviewed, 80-81.
"Early Philadelphia, its people, life and progress," by H. M. Lippincott, reviewed, 93-97.
"Ecclesiastical control in Quebec, Rise of," by W. A. Riddell, reviewed, 240-242.
Eckenrode, H. J., "Revolution in Virginia," reviewed, 98-101.
"Economic legislation in Iowa, History of," by I. L. Pollock, reviewed, 494-496.
EDWARDS, MARTHA L., *Religious forces in the United States, 1815-1830*, 434-449.
"El Dorado, Quest of," by J. A. Zahm, reviewed, 83-85.
"English settler in pioneer Wisconsin," by M. M. Quaife, reviewed, 493-494.
ESAREY, LOGAN, *Literary spirit among the early Ohio valley settlers*, 143-157.
"European treaties bearing on the history of the United States and its dependencies to 1648," by F. G. Davenport, reviewed, 469-470.
"Family, Social history of the American," by A. W. Calhoun, reviewed, 87-89.
Faris, John T., "Romance of old Philadelphia," reviewed, 487-488.
Farish, Thomas E., "History of Arizona," reviewd, 109-110.
Ferguson, Maxwell, "State regulation of railroads in the south," reviewed, 105-106.
"First book in American history with European beginnings," by G. V. D. Southworth, reviewed, 242-243.
"First Canadians in France," by F. M. Bell, reviewed, 240.
First railroad between the Mississsippi and Lake Superior, by L. B. Shippee, 121-142; conditions necessitate a link between the Mississippi and Lake Superior, 121-123; project considered before the war, 123-124; incidental advantages and disadvantages, 124-125; St. Paul voted to grant a bonus to the railroad company, 126-128; opposition to scheme by portions of Minnesota and Wisconsin roads, 128-132; discussion in congress, passage of bill, 133-134; work of factions in Washington for and against the measure, 134-138; local strife as to location of southern terminus, 139-140; opening of road in 1871, 141; road leases in 1872 to Northern Pacific railroad, 142.
FISH, C. R., (R) Treat's "Early diplomatic relations between the United States and Japan, 1853-1865," 80-81.
Fiske, Frank, "Taming of the Sioux," reviewed, 110.
"Fiske, Life and letters of John," by J. S. Clark, reviewed, 222.
"Florida, West, controversy, 1798-1813," by I. J. Cox, reviewed, 488-490.

Ford, Worthington C., "Writings of John Quincy Adams," reviewed, 220-222.
"Formation of the state of Oklahoma (1803-1906)," by R. Gittinger, reviewed, 233-235.
"France, 1707-1800, Controversy over neutral rights between the United States and," by J. B. Scott, reviewed, 216-217.
"France, First Canadians in," by F. M. Bell, reviewed, 240.
"French and Spanish rivalry in the gulf region of the United States, 1678-1702," by W. E. Dunn, reviewed, 501-503.
Frontier, Passing of the, by A. C. Cole, 288-312.
"Frontier retreat on the upper Ohio, 1779-1781," by L. P. Kellogg, reviewed, 363.
FULLER, G. N., (R) Quaife's "English settler in pioneer Wisconsin," 493-494.
GARDNER, C. O., (R) Bacon's "American plan of government," 85-87.
GARNER, JAMES W., (R) Gibson's "Journal from our legation in Belgium," 78-79.
"George Caleb Bingham, the Missouri artist," by F. H. Rusk, reviewed, 225-226.
"Georgia as a proprietary province," by J. R. McCain, reviewed, 101-102.
Gibson, Hugh, "Journal from our legation in Belgium," reviewed, 78-79.
Gittinger, Roy, "Formation of the state of Oklahoma (1903-1906)," reviewed, 233-235.
"Government, American plan of," by C. W. Bacon, reviewed, 85-87.
Griffis, William E., "Mikado institution and person," reviewed, 81-83.
GRONERT, THEODORE G., *Trade in the Blue-Grass region, 1810-1820*, 313-323.
"Gulf region of the United States, 1678-1702, Spanish and French rivalry in," by W. E. Dunn, reviewed, 501-503.
Hamilton, J. G. de Roulhac and Mary T. Hamilton, "Life of Robert E. Lee," reviewed, 370.
Hamilton, Mary Thompson and J. G. de R. Hamilton, "Life of Robert E. Lee," reviewed, 370.
"Handbook of manuscripts in the library of congress," reviewed, 351.
Hanna, Mary A., "Trade of the Delaware district before the revolution," reviewed, 97-98.
Hanscom, Elizabeth D., "Heart of the Puritan," reviewed, 220.
Hayden, Horace E., "Proceedings and collections of the Wyoming historical and geological society for the year 1917," reviewed, 236-237.
"Heart of the Puritan," by E. D. Hanscom, reviewed, 220.
HENDERSON, ARCHIBALD, *Mecklenburg declaration of independence* (doc.), 207-215.
Herrick, Francis H., "Audubon the naturalist," reviewed, 226-228.
HICKS, JOHN D., (R) Gittinger's "Formation of the state of Oklahoma (1803-1906)," 233-235; (R) Pyle's "Life of James J. Hill," 223-225.
"Hill, Life of James J.," by J. G. Pyle, reviewed, 223-225.
Historical activities in Canada, 1917-1918, by J. A. Kenney, 190-206; the war, 190-193; acquisition of material, 193-194; bibliographies, guides, and calendars, 194-195; publication of source material, 195-198; meetings and published transactions, 198-200; periodical literature, 200-201; monographs and general treatises, 201-203; marking of historic sites, 203-204; ethnological and archaeological work, 204-206.
"Historical and geological society for the year 1917, Proceedings and collections of the Wyoming," by H. E. Hayden, reviewed, 236-237.
Historical activities in the old northwest, by A. C. Cole, 51-69; organization, legislation, and equipment, 51-53; acquisition of source material, 53-54; publication of source material, 54-57; meetings and published transactions, 57-59; periodical literature, 59-63; monographs and general treatises, 63-67; miscellaneous publications and activities, 67-79.
"Historic Mackinac," by E. O. Wood, reviewed, 364.
"History of Arizona," by T. E. Farish, reviewed, 109-110.
"History of economic legislation in Iowa," by I. L. Pollock, reviewed, 494-496.
"History of labour in the United States," by J. R. Commons and associates, reviewed, 477-479.
"History of Missouri," by E. M. Violette, reviewed, 497-500.
"History of paper-manufacturing in the United States, 1690-1916," by L. H. Weeks, reviewed, 218-219.
"History of the American people," by C. A. Beard and W. C. Bagley, reviewed, 473-474.
"History of the Pacific northwest," by Joseph Schafer, reviewed, 235-236.

"History of the American family, Social," by A. W. Calhoun, reviewed, 87-89.
"History of transportation in the United States before 1860," by C. E. MacGill, reviewed, 89-90.
"History, Processes of," by F. J. Teggart, reviewed, 473.
"History with European beginnings, First book in American," by G. V. D. Southworth, reviewed, 242-243.
Hoagland, H. E., "Wage bargaining on the vessels of the great lakes," reviewed, 106-107.
Hockett, Homer C., "Western influence on political parties to 1825," reviewed, 355.
Homestead bill, Andrew Johnson and the early phases of, by St. G. L. Sioussat, 253-287.
"Houston in Texas, With Sam," by E. L. Sabin, reviewed, 108-109.
"Houston, Sam," by G. S. Bryan, reviewed, 369.
Hulbert, Archer B., "Ohio in the time of the confederation," reviewed, 490-492.
"Illinois and Michigan canal," by J. W. Putnam, reviewed, 492.
"Illinois and the nation," by O. R. Trowbridge and G. P. Randle, reviewed, 364.
"Illinois in the fifties," by C. B. Johnson, reviewed, 107-108.
"Illinois, Lincoln in," by O. Roberts, reviewed, 369.
"Indian, American," by C. Wissler, reviewed, 352-354.
"Indiana, Play-party in," by L. J. Wolford, reviewed, 232-233.
Indians, Origin of the name of the Creek (doc.), by V. W. Crane, 337-342.
"Insurance, Workmen's compensation and," by D. H. Van Doren, reviewed, 479.
"Invasion of the city of Washington," by J. M. Stahl, reviewed, 487.
"Iowa, History of economic legislation in," by I. L. Pollock, reviewed, 494-496.
JAMES, JAMES A., (R) Ford's "Writings of John Quincy Adams," 220-222; (R) Kellogg's "Frontier retreat on the upper Ohio," 363.
"Japan, Development of," by K. S. Latourette, reviewed, 471-472.
"Japan, 1853-1865, Early diplomatic relations with the United States," by P. J. Treat, reviewed, 80-81.
JENKS, WILLIAM L., *Territorial legislation by governor and judges,* 36-50.
Johnson, Andrew, and the early phases of the homestead bill, by St. G. L. Sioussat, 253-287.
Johnson, Charles B., "Illinois in the fifties," reviewed, 107-108.
"Journal from our legation in Belgium," by H. Gibson, reviewed, 78-79.
"Ka-Mi-Akin: the last hero of the Yakimas," by A. J. Splawn, reviewed, 354.
Keith, Charles P., "Chronicles of Pennsylvania," reviewed, 358.
KELLAR, HERBERT A., (R) Brooks' "Story of corn and the western migration," 90-91.
KELLOGG, LOUISE P., "Frontier retreat on the upper Ohio, 1779-1781," reviewed, 363; (R) Pelzer's "Marches of the Dragoons in the Mississippi valley," 230-231; (R) Riddell's "Rise of ecclesiastical control in Quebec," 240-242.
KENNEY, JAMES F., *Historical activities in Canada, 1917-1918,* 190-206.
"Kentucky prior to 1850, Anti-slavery movement in," by A. E. Martin, reviewed, 361-363.
Kettleborough, Charles, "State constitutions and the federal constitution and organic laws of the territories and other colonial dependencies of the United States of America," reviewed, 476.
Knight, Alice J., "Las Casas," reviewed, 471.
"Labour in the United States, History of," by J. R. Commons and associates, reviewed, 477-479.
Lake Superior, First railroad between the Mississippi and, by L. B. Shippee, 121-142.
"Lancaster: old and new, Story of," by W. Riddle, reviewed, 359-361.
LANGDON, WILLIAM C., (R) Wolford's "Play-party in Indiana," 232-233.
LARSON, L. M. (R) Martin's "Diary of a nation, 79.
"Las Casas," by A. J. Knight, reviewed, 471.
"Latest light on Abraham Lincoln and wartime memories," by E. Chapman, reviewed, 348.
Latourette, Kenneth S., "Development of Japan," reviewed, 471-472.
"Leaders, Voices of our," by W. M. Lewis, reviewed, 369.
LEE, JUDSON F., (R) Hoagland's "Wage bargaining on the vessels of the great lakes," 106-107.
"Lee, Life of Robert E.," by J. G. de R. and M. T. Hamilton, reviewed, 370.
"Legation in Belgium, Journal from our," by H. Gibson, reviewed, 78-79.
Legislation by governor and judges, Territorial, by W. L. Jenks, 36-50.

Lescohier, D. D., (R) Van Doren's "Workmen's compensation and insurance," 479.
Letter from New Madrid, 1789 (doc.), by E. G. Swem, 342-346.
Letters of John Ball (doc.), by M. M. Quaife, 450-468.
Levy, T. Aaron, "Lincoln, the politician," reviewed, 482.
Lewis, William M., "Voices of our leaders," reviewed, 369.
"Librarian of congress, Report of the, and report of the superintendent of the library building and grounds," reviewed, 349-351.
"Library of congress, Handbook of manuscripts in," reviewed, 351.
"Life and letters of John Fiske," by J. S. Clark, reviewed, 222.
"Life of James J. Hill," by J. G. Pyle, reviewed, 223-225.
"Life of Robert E. Lee," by J. G. de R. and M. T. Hamilton, reviewed, 370.
"Lincoln, Abraham," by C. P. Bissett, reviewed, 91-92.
"Lincoln in Illinois," by O. Roberts, reviewed, 369.
"Lincoln, the politician," by T. A. Levy, reviewed, 482.
"Lincoln, Voice of," by R. M. Wanamaker, reviewed, 483-485.
Lippincott, Horace M., "Early Philadelphia, its people, life and progress," reviewed, 93-97.
Literary spirit among the early Ohio valley settlers, by Logan Esarey, 143-157; extravagance of statement in volumes of "travels," oratory, verse, 143-149; pathos in ballads, 150-153; schools of Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, 153-154; reviews, 154-155; commercial influence, 155-156; summary, 156-157.
Lonn, Ella, "Reconstruction in Louisiana after 1868," reviewed, 366-368.
Lost commission: a study in Mississippi history, by J. E. Winston, 158-189; political situation in Mississippi, popularity of Van Buren, 158-161; discussion as to annexation of Texas, 161-164; manifesto by Mississippi delegation, 164-166; defeat of Van Buren, 166; popularity of Calhoun and Davis, 167-168; defense of and attacks against Walker, 169-174; statement of commission given to Walker, 174; result, 175; contemporary accounts by Thompson, 175-176; newspaper controversy, 176-177; Walker's justification of his action, 177-178; protest by whig journals, 179-180; Gwin's statement, 180-181; Walker's appeal to Polk, 181-183; Gwin's connection with Choctaw and Chickasaw claims, 183-188, later points in careers of the principals, 188-189.
Louisiana during the nineties, Populism in, by M. J. White, 3-19.
"Louisiana after 1868, Reconstruction in," by E. Lonn, reviewed, 366-368.
Lowry, Lucile A., (R) Bell's "First Canadians in France," 240.
Lutz, Harley L., "State tax commission," reviewed, 217-218.
"Mackinac, Historic," by E. O. Wood, reviewed, 364.
Martin, Asa E., "Anti-slavery movement in Kentucky prior to 1850," reviewed, 361-363.
"Massacre, Spirit lake," by T. Teakle, reviewed, 496-497.
Mathews, J. M., (R) Kettleborough's "State constitutions and the federal constitution and organic laws of the territories and other colonial dependencies of the United States of America," 476-477.
McCain, James R., "Georgia as a proprietary province," reviewed, 101-102.
MacGill, Caroline E., "History of transportation in the United States before 1860," reviewed, 89-90.
"Manuscripts from the Burton historical collection," by C. M. Burton, reviewed, 222-223.
"Marches of the Dragoons in the Mississippi valley," by L. Pelzer, reviewed, 230-231.
Martin, Edward S., "Diary of a nation," reviewed, 79.
Meany, Edmond S., (R) Schafer's "History of the Pacific northwest," 235-236.
Mecklenburg declaration of independence (doc.), by A. Henderson, 207-215.
"Michigan and Illinois canal," by J. W. Putnam, reviewed, 492.
"Migration, Story of corn and the western," by E. C. Brooks, reviewed, 90-91.
"Mikado institution and person," by W. E. Griffis, reviewed, 81-83.
Miller, Irving E., and P. Monroe, "American spirit," reviewed, 474.
Miner, W. H., (R) Splawn's "Ka-Mi-Akin; the last hero of the Yakimas," 354; (R) Wissler's "American Indian," 352-354.
Mississippi and Lake Superior, First railroad between the, by L. B. Shippee, 121-142.
Mississippi history: Lost commission: a study in, by J. E. Winston, 158-189.
Mississippi valley, 1861-1865, Commercial intercourse with the confederacy in the, by E. M. Coulter, 377-395.
"Missouri, History of," by E. M. Violette, reviewed, 497-500.

Monroe, Paul, and I. E. Miller, "American spirit," reviewed, 474.
Muir, John, "Cruise of the Corwin," reviewed, 110-112.
MURPHEY, HERMON K., *Northern railroads and the civil war*, 324-338.
"Naturalist, Audubon the," by F. H. Herrick, reviewed, 226-228.
Nebraska state historical society, "Publications," reviewed, 500.
"Negro slavery, American," by U. B. Phillips, reviewed, 480-482.
New Madrid, 1789, Letter from (doc.), by E. G. Swem, 342-346.
Northern railroads and the civil war, by H. K. Murphey, 324-338; weaknesses of railroads at outbreak of war, 324-326; even distribution of shipping, 326; water transportation employed, 327; railroads operating under capacity, 327; government supervision, 328-329; rates, 330-332; draft of railroad employees, 333; taxation of roads, 334; effects of war, 335-338.
Northwest, Historical activities in the old, by A. C. Cole, 51-69.
"Northwest, History of the Pacific," by J. Schafer, reviewed, 235-236.
"Official letter books of W. C. C. Claiborne, 1801-1816," by D. Rowland, reviewed, 102-105.
"Ohio, Frontier retreat on the upper," by L. P. Kellogg, reviewed, 363.
"Ohio in four wars," by D. J. Ryan, reviewed, 229.
"Ohio in the time of the confederation," by A. B. Hulbert, reviewed, 490-492.
Ohio valley settlers, Literary spirit among the early, by Logan Esarey, 143-157.
"Oklahoma (1803-1906), Formation of the state of," by R. Gittinger, reviewed, 233-235.
OLMSTEAD, A. T., (R) Latourette's "Development of Japan," 471-472.
Origin of the name of the Creek Indians (doc.), by V. W. Crane, 337-342.
"Pacific northwest, History of the," by J. Schafer, reviewed, 235-236.
Pacific railroad, 1845-1850, Early agitation for a, by R. S. Cotterill, 396-414.
Page, Ralph W., "Dramatic moments in American diplomacy," reviewed, 471.
"Paper-manufacturing in the United States, 1690-1916, History of," by L. H. Weeks, reviewed, 218-219.
Passing of the frontier, by A. C. Cole, 288-312; development of Illinois during the fifties: growth of cities, 288-295; emigration from Illinois, 295-298; immigration, American born, 299-302; German and Irish, 302-303; French, 303-305; Portuguese, 305; Norwegian and Swedish, 305-306; English, 307; Irish, 307-309; German, 309-312.
PATTERSON, BURD S., (R.) Riddle's "Story of Lancaster: old and new," 359-361.
Pelzer, Louis, "Marches of the Dragoons in the Mississippi valley," reviewed, 230-231.
"Pennsylvania, Chronicles of," by C. P. Keith, reviewed, 358.
"Pennsylvania, Commonwealth of," by T. K. Smith, reviewed, 357.
PERSINGER, C. E., (R) Nebraska state historical society, "Publications," 500.
"Philadelphia, its people, life and progress, Early," by H. M. Lippincott, reviewed, 93-97.
"Philadelphia, Romance of old," by J. T. Faris, reviewed, 487-488.
PHILLIPS, PAUL C., (R) Scott's "Controversy over neutral rights between the United States and France, 1797-1800," 216-217.
Pitman, Frank W., "Development of the British West Indies, 1700-1763," reviewed, 238-240.
Phillips, Ulrich B., "American negro slavery," reviewed, 480-482.
"Plattsburg, Battle of: a study in and of the war of 1812," by J. M. Stahl, reviewed, 485-487.
"Play-party in Indiana," by L. J. Wolford, reviewed, 232-233.
"Political parties, Western influence on, to 1825," by H. C. Hockett, reviewed, 355.
Pollock, Ivan L., "History of economic legislation in Iowa," reviewed, 494-496.
POOLEY, WILLIAM V., (R) Bissett's "Abraham Lincoln," 91-92; (R) Eckenrode's "Revolution in Virginia," 98-101.
Populism in Louisiana during the nineties, by M. J. White, 3-19; cause of populism, 3-4; farmers' alliance, 4-5; formation of people's party, 5-7; great issue of 1892, 7; contest over presidential campaign, influence of Arkansas election, 8-9; attempt by populists to break the "solid south," 9-12; election result, 12; disorderly state campaign of 1896, end of people's party, republican fusion, 14-17; populists with democrats in presidential campaign, 17-19; end of populism in Louisiana, 19.
"President Wilson's foreign policy: messages, addresses, papers," by J. B. Scott, reviewed, 347.
PRIESTLEY, H. I., (R) "Spanish and

French rivalry in the gulf region of the United States, 1678-1702," 501-503.
"Proceedings and collections of the Wyoming historical and geological society for the year 1917," by H. E. Hayden, reviewed, 236-237.
"Processes of history," by F. J. Teggart, reviewed, 473.
"Publications," Nebraska state historical society, reviewed, 500.
"Puritan, Heart of the," by E. D. Hanscom, reviewed, 220.
Putnam, James W., "Illinois and Michigan canal," reviewed, 492.
Putnam, Ruth, "California: the name," reviewed, 237-238.
Pyle, Joseph P., "Life of James J. Hill," reviewed, 223-225.
QUAIFE, MILO M., "English settler in pioneer Wisconsin," reviewed, 493-494; (doc.) *Letters of John Ball*, 450-468.
"Quebec, Rise of ecclesiastical control in," by W. A. Riddell, reviewed, 240-242.
"Quest of El Dorado," by J. A. Zahm, reviewed, 83-85.
Railroad between the Mississippi and Lake Superior, First, by L. B. Shippee, 121-142.
Railroad, 1845-1850, Early agitation for a Pacific, by R. S. Cotterill, 396-414.
"Railroads in the south, State regulation of," by M. Ferguson, reviewed, 105-106.
Railroads, Northern, and the civil war, by H. K. Murphey, 324-338.
RAMSDELL, CHARLES W., (R) Bryan's "Sam Houston," 369.
Randle, Gilbert P., and O. R. Trowbridge, "Illinois and the nation," reviewed, 364.
RAY, P. ORMAN, (R) Hockett's "Western influence on political parties to 1825," 355.
Reconsideration of the gold discoveries in the northwest (doc.), by W. Trimble, 70-77.
"Reconstruction in Louisiana after 1868," by E. Lonn, reviewed, 366-368.
"Regulation of railroads in the south, State," by M. Ferguson, reviewed, 105-106.
"Relations between the United States and Japan, 1853-1865, Early diplomatic," by P. J. Treat, reviewed, 80-81.
Religious forces in the United States, 1815-1830, by M. L. Edwards, 434-449; importance of religious factor, 434-435; principle of religious liberty, 436-437; individualistic character of all denominations, 437-438; lack of friction, 438-439; control of property by laity, 439-441; selection of ministers by laity, 441-442; points of contact between church and state, 442-445; the federal executive and religious organizations, 446-447; characteristics of religious life, 447-448.
"Report of the librarian of congress and report of the superintendent of the library building and grounds," reviewed, 349-351.
"Revolution in Virginia," by H. J. Eckenrode, reviewed, 98-101.
"Revolution, Trade of the Delaware district before the," by M. A. Hanna, reviewed, 97-98.
Riddell, Walter A., "Rise of ecclesiastical control in Quebec," reviewed, 240-242.
Riddle, William, "Story of Lancaster: old and new," reviewed, 359-361.
"Rise of ecclesiastical control in Quebec," by W. A. Riddell, reviewed, 240-242.
Roberts, Octavia, "Lincoln in Illinois," reviewed, 369.
ROBERTSON, JAMES R., (R) Martin's "Anti-slavery movement in Kentucky prior to 1850," 361-363.
"Romance of old Philadelphia," by J. T. Faris, reviewed, 487-488.
Rowland, Dunbar, "Official letter books of W. C. C. Claiborne, 1801-1816," reviewed, 102-105.
Rusk, Fern H., "George Caleb Bingham, the Missouri artist," reviewed, 225-226.
Ryan, Daniel J., "Ohio in four wars," reviewed, 229.
Sabin, Edwin L., "With Sam Houston in Texas," reviewed, 108-109.
"Sam Houston," by G. S. Bryan, reviewed, 369.
SANFORD, ALBERT H., (R) Beard and Bagley's "History of the American people," 473-474; (R) Southworth's "First book in American history with European beginnings," 242-243; (R) Trowbridge and Randle's "Illinois and the nation," 364.
Schafer, Joseph, "History of the Pacific northwest," reviewed, 235-236.
Scott, James B., "Controversy over neutral rights between the United States and France, 1797-1800," reviewed, 216-217; "President Wilson's foreign policy: messages, addresses, papers," reviewed, 347.
SCROGGS, WILLIAM O., (R) Ferguson's "State regulation of railroads in the south," 105-106.
SHIPPEE, LESTER B., *First railroad between the Mississippi and Lake Superior*, 121-142.

SHOEMAKER, F. C., (R) Violette's "History of Missouri," 497-500.
SIOUSSAT, ST. GEORGE L., *Andrew Johnson and the early phases of the homestead bill*, 253-287.
"Sioux, Taming of the," by F. Fiske, reviewed, 110.
"Slavery, American negro," by U. B. Phillips, reviewed, 480-482.
Smith, Alice R. and D. E. Huger Smith, "Dwelling houses of Charleston, South Carolina," reviewed, 93-97.
Smith, Thomas K., "The commonwealth of Pennsylvania," reviewed, 357.
"Social history of the American family," by A. W. Calhoun, reviewed, 87-89.
South Carolina and the early tariffs, by J. L. Conger, 415-433; sectional divisions of South Carolina, 415-416; nationalism in the state, 416-418; opposition to national bank, 419; to federal internal improvements, 420-421; to tariffs, 421; fear for slavery, 422-423; tariff of 1816, 423; tariff of 1820, 424; tariff of 1824, 425-426; the "woolens bill," 426-427; diversion caused by Jackson's campaign, 428-430; attack on tariff by McDuffie, 431; position of Cardoza, 431; growth of radical spirit, 432.
Southworth, Gertrude V. D., "First book in American history with European beginnings," reviewed, 242-243.
"Spanish and French rivalry in the gulf region of the United States, 1678-1702," by W. E. Dunn, reviewed, 501-503.
"Spirit lake massacre," by T. Teakle, reviewed, 496-497.
Splawn, A. J., "Ka-Mi-Akin: the last hero of the Yakimas," reviewed, 354.
Stahl, John M., "Battle of Plattsburg: a study in and of the war of 1812," reviewed, 485-487; "Invasion of the city of Washington," reviewed, 487.
Stanard, Mary N., "Colonial Virginia, its people and customs," reviewed, 93-97.
"State constitutions and the federal constitution and organic laws of the territories and other colonial dependencies of the United States of America," by C. Kettleborough, reviewed, 476-477.
"State regulation of railroads in the south," by M. Ferguson, reviewed, 105-106.
"State tax commission," by H. L. Lutz, reviewed, 217-218.
Stephen F. Austin, by E. C. Barker, 20-35; early life of Austin, 20; his conception of the task of colonizing Texas, 20-22; conditions in Texas and Mexico in 1821, 22-24; Austin's power for seven years, 24-25; handling of land grants, 25-28; early constructive work with the colonists, some misconstruction by them, 28-32; views on slavery, 34; character of the man, 34-35.
STEVENS, JAMES G., (R) Calhoun's "Social history of the American family," 87-89.
"Story of corn and the western migration," by E. C. Brooks, reviewed, 90-91.
"Story of Lancaster: old and new," by W. Riddle, reviewed, 359-361.
SWEET, W. W., (R) Wanamaker's "Voice of Lincoln," 483-485.
SWEM, EARL G., *Letter from New Madrid, 1789* (doc.), 342-346.
"Taming of the Sioux," by F. Fiske, reviewed, 110.
Tariffs, South Carolina and the early, by J. L. Conger, 415-433.
"Tax commission, State," by H. L. Lutz, reviewed, 217-218.
Teakle, Thomas, "Spirit lake massacre," reviewed, 496-497.
Tèggart, Frederick J., "Processes of history," reviewed, 473.
Territorial legislation by governor and judges, by W. L. Jenks, 36-50; northwest territory, 36-41; Mississippi territory, 41-44; southwest territory, 44; Indiana territory, 44-45; Michigan territory, 45-48; Illinois territory, 48-50.
"Texas, With Sam Houston in," by E. L. Sabin, reviewed, 108-109.
"Thirty-first annual report of the bureau of American ethnology," reviewed, 475.
Trade in the Blue-Grass region, 1810-1820, by T. G. Gronert, 313-323; peculiar characteristics of the region, 313; need of transportation facilities, 314; demand for local manufactures, 315; support given to protection policy, 316; high cost of transportation, 317; influence of economic conditions on politics, 318-319; rivalry of Louisville, 319-321; ruin of Blue-Grass commercial and industrial interests, 321-322; influx of northern elements, 322-323.
"Trade of the Delaware district before the revolution," by M. A. Hanna, reviewed, 97-98.
"Transportation in the United States before 1860, History of," by C. E. MacGill, reviewed, 89-90.
"Treaties, European, bearing on the history of the United States and its dependencies to 1648," by F. G. Davenport, reviewed, 469-470.
Treat, Payson J., "Early diplomatic relations between the United States and Japan, 1853-1865," reviewed, 80-81.

Trimble, William, *Reconsideration of gold discoveries in the northwest* (doc.), 70-77.
Trowbridge, Oliver R., and G. P. Randle, "Illinois and the nation," reviewed, 364.
"United States and its dependencies to 1648, European treaties bearing on the history of," by F. G. Davenport, reviewed, 469-470.
"United States, History of labour in," by J. R. Commons and associates, reviewed, 477-479.
"United States of America, State constitutions and the federal constitution and organic laws of the territories and other colonial dependencies of," by C. Kettleborough, reviewed, 476-477.
United States, 1815-1830, Religious forces in, by M. L. Edwards, 434-449.
"United States, 1678-1702, Spanish and French rivalry in the gulf region of," by W. E. Dunn, reviewed, 501-503.
Van Doren, Durand H., "Workmen's compensation and insurance," reviewed, 479.
Varnum, William H., (R) Rusk's "George Caleb Bingham, the Missouri artist," 225-226.
"Vessels of the great lakes, Wage bargaining on the," by H. E. Hoagland, reviewed, 106-107.
Vickers, E. H., (R) Griffis' "Mikado institution and person," 81-83.
Violette, Eugene M., "History of Missouri," reviewed, 497-500.
"Virginia, its people and customs, Colonial," by M. N. Stanard, reviewed, 93-97.
"Virginia, Revolution in," by H. J. Eckenrode, reviewed, 98-101.
Virtue, Ethel, (R) "Handbook of manuscripts in the library of congress," 351.
"Voice of Lincoln," by R. M. Wanamaker, reviewed, 483-485.
"Voices of our leaders," by W. M. Lewis, reviewed, 369.
"Wage bargaining on the vessels of the great lakes," by H. E. Hoagland, reviewed, 106-107.
Wanamaker, R. M., "Voice of Lincoln," reviewed, 483-485.
Ward, Henry B., (R) Herrick's "Audubon the naturalist," 226-228; (R) Muir's "Cruise of the Corwin," 110-112.
"War of 1812, Battle of Plattsburg: a study in and of the," by J. M. Stahl, reviewed, 485-487.
"Wars, Ohio in four," by D. J. Ryan, reviewed, 229.
"Washington, Invasion of the city of," by J. M. Stahl, reviewed, 487.
Way, R. B., (R) Hanna's "Trade of the Delaware district before the revolution," 97-98; (R) Putnam's "Illinois and Michigan canal," 492.
Webster, H. J., (R) Keith's "Chronicles of Pennsylvania," 358; (R) Smith's "Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," 357.
Weeks, Lyman H., "History of paper-manufacturing in the United States, 1609-1916," reviewed, 218-219.
Westergaard, Waldemar, (R) Pitman's "Development of the British West Indies, 1700-1763," 238-240.
"Western influence on political parties to 1825," by H. C. Hockett, reviewed, 355.
"West Florida controversy, 1798-1813," by I. J. Cox, reviewed, 488-490.
"West Indies, 1700-1763, Development of the British," by F. W. Pitman, reviewed, 238-240.
White, Melvin J., *Populism in Louisiana during the nineties*, 3-19.
Willard, James F., (R) Hayden's "Proceedings and collections of the Wyoming historical and geological society for the year 1917," 236-237.
Wilson, M. L., (R) Fiske's "Taming of the Sioux," 110.
"Wilson, President, foreign policy of: messages, addresses, papers," by J. B. Scott, reviewed, 347.
Winston, James E., *Lost commission: a study in Mississippi history*, 158-189.
"Wisconsin, English settler in pioneer," by M. M. Quaife, reviewed, 493-494.
Wissler, Clark, "American Indian," reviewed, 352.
"With Sam Houston in Texas," by E. L. Sabin, reviewed, 108-109.
Wolford, Leah J., "Play-party in Indiana," reviewed, 232-233.
Wood, Edwin O., "Historic Mackinac," reviewed, 364.
Woodson, C. G., (R) Phillips' "American negro slavery," 480-482.
"Workmen's compensation and insurance," by D. H. Van Doren, reviewed, 479.
"Writings of John Quincy Adams," by W. C. Ford, reviewed, 220-222.
"Wyoming historical and geological society for the year 1917, Proceedings and collections of the," by H. E. Hayden, reviewed, 236-237.
"Yakimas, Ka-Mi-Akin: the last hero of the," by A. J. Splawn, reviewed, 354.
Zahm, J. A., "Quest of El Dorado," reviewed, 83-85.

THERE IS NOT ROOM HERE TO TELL YOU ABOUT THE NEW BREASTED ANCIENT, HARDING EUROPEAN, HART AMERICAN

HISTORY MAPS

You must see these maps to appreciate them. We ship them entirely on approval. The best schools in the land are using them. These include universities, colleges, normal schools, and high schools.

For full particulars fill in, cut out, and mail the coupon below.

DENOYER-GEPPERT COMPANY

AMERICA'S LEADING SCHOOL MAP PUBLISHERS

406 EAST OHIO STREET :: :: CHICAGO

GENTELMEN: Send particulars on items checked:

☐ Breasted Ancient History Maps
☐ Harding European History Maps
☐ Hart-Bolton American History Maps

Name .....

School .....

Address .....

MVHR 9-18

The World War for Democracy

By

W. N. SAGE, M.A. (Oxon)
Department of History, University of British Columbia

ELMER E. RUSH, M.A., L.L. B.
Associate Editor of the History of Civilization and Progress of the World

AND SPECIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Giving an Account of the Causes and Events of the World War, Illustrated by Maps, Etchings and Half-Tones

(Official Photographs)

This is without a doubt the greatest one volume war book extant. The causes of the war are set out in full by Prof. Sage. Each campaign and action is fully discussed by the authors. Diagrams, charts, and half-tones render the book lucid and practical for the student. Questions on the war, with the pages indicated where the answers may be found, add to its usefulness. An account of the pre-war history of the invaded lands of Europe is a convenient and useful addition. A patriotic section in colors is designed for soldiers' and sailors' service records. Special offer to readers of this magazine on orders reaching us not later than May 15th. SEND YOUR ORDER NOW and receive this beautiful and instructive book. Thirty-two pages of samples FREE while they last.

AGENTS WANTED EVERYWHERE

McINDOO PUBLISHING CO. GRAND AVENUE TEMPLE BLD. KANSAS CITY, MO.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

Published quarterly at Cedar Rapids, Iowa. This notice required by the Act of Congress of August 12, 1912.

Editor, Dr. Clarence W. Alvord, Urbana, Illinois.
Managing Editor, Dr. Clarence W. Alvord, Urbana, Illinois.
Business Manager, Mrs. C. S. Paine, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Publisher, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Lincoln, Nebraska.
Owner, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Lincoln, Nebraska.
There are no bond holders, mortgages, or other security holders.

CLARA S. PAINE, Secretary.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 11th day of March, 1919, by Clara S. Paine, Secretary.

MAX WESTERWARR, Notary Public.
(My commission expires August 4, 1921)

The Mississippi Valley Historical Review

Board of Editors

SOLON J. BUCK
LAWRENCE J. BURPEE
ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT
DAN E. CLARK
ISAAC J. COX
MILO M. QUAIFE
WALTER L. FLEMING
JAMES A. JAMES

Managing Editor

CLARENCE W. ALVORD

Guarantors

CHARLES G. DAWES
FRANK O. LOWDEN
CYRUS H. McCORMICK
HENRY J. PATTEN
JULIUS ROSENWALD
OTTO L. SCHMIDT
ANNA SILVER
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY
ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL LIBRARY
STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF WISCONSIN

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. V, NO. 1 JUNE, 1918

POPULISM IN LOUISIANA DURING THE NINETIES

The populist movement in Louisiana during the nineties derives its chief importance from its effects, not only upon political developments in Louisiana, but, more or less directly, upon political developments in other southern states. This was due to complications growing out of the presence of the negro, particularly the use that was made of his vote in the course of the struggle between the populists and the democrats for control of the state government. Judged solely by election returns, the movement was comparatively unimportant; the greatest success ever won by the party at the polls was the election of a few members to the state legislature.

Populism everywhere was a product of hard times, the principal cause for which, so far as Louisiana was concerned, was the depression in the cotton industry. The stimulus of high prices during the decade immediately following the war caused planters and farmers throughout the lower south to give almost exclusive attention to the cultivation of cotton. Over-production resulted, and, beginning about the middle seventies, prices declined until by the late eighties or early nineties they fell far below the margin of profitable cultivation. The low-water mark was reached in Louisiana in 1894, when the general average farm price for cotton was four and three-tenths cents per pound.[1] Here, as elsewhere in this region, crop diversification had not been practiced to any great extent, and cash capital was lacking, since the profits of the flush years had been expended in repairing the wastes of war, in restocking farms and plantations, and

[1] *Yearbook of the United States department of agriculture*, 1895, 536.

in clearing and preparing new lands for cultivation.[2] The Louisiana business man probably felt the pinch of hard times less than the small farmer in the hill parishes of the state, but he too was affected by the low price of the leading staple.[3] Both naturally felt the influence of nation-wide business depressions, particularly of the panic of 1893.[4] Besides these, the people of the state suffered a series of natural calamities between the years 1891 and 1896, inclusive, that certainly added to the prevailing distress and discontent which made the times favorable for the rise and development of political movements expected to afford relief. Crevasses in the years 1891 and 1892, especially those of the late spring of 1892, resulted in overflows in the valleys of the Mississippi and Red rivers that destroyed property valued at several millions of dollars. Several thousands of people were made homeless and reduced to the point of starvation, crops were destroyed, stock was drowned, and many of the overflowed lands rendered unproductive for years.[5] The drought of the spring and summer of 1896, which was the last of the misfortunes of this period, caused an almost total loss of crops in the hill parishes. At the same time charbon appeared in several localities, in many cases taking off all the work animals the farmers owned.[6]

The farmer's alliance, or the farmer's union, to give it the earlier name it went by in Louisiana, spread into the state from Texas, where it originated about 1876.[7] Here, as elsewhere, its original object was to organize and enlighten the farmers, promote better agricultural methods, and make farm life more attractive.[8] By the year 1888 it was reported strong in north

[2] The southern agricultural situation during the years under review is treated in the *Twelfth census of the United States, 1900, agriculture*, 6: 407. The *Times-Democrat* (New Orleans), September 4, 1892, contains an official cotton crop report by Secretary Heston, of the New Orleans cotton exchange, which deals with the same subject.

[3] *Ibid.*, September 1, 1896.

[4] *Ibid.*, September 16, 1896.

[5] *Ibid.*, September 1, 1892.

[6] *Ibid.*, September 15, 25, and 29, 1896.

[7] *World almanac*, 1891 (New York, 1891-), 93; *Harper's encyclopaedia of United States history*, 3: 311.

[8] The following tribute to the alliance was copied from the *Monroe Bulletin* (date not given), and printed in the *Times-Democrat*, September 7, 1896: "The greatest

Louisiana, and active in politics, though not as a distinct political organization. The farmers at this time were for the most part staunch democrats, their political activities being confined to the support of such candidates of that party for state offices as would subscribe to the principles of the alliance. A typical farmer's alliance platform of this period, that of De Soto parish, is of interest on account of the comprehensive legislation demanded of the state and national governments. In making demands for immediate steps to prevent foreign non-residents from acquiring land titles in the United States, for laws to prevent the dealing in futures of all agricultural products, and for the enactment of a new commerce law, the De Soto farmers anticipated, in substance at least, three demands of the Ocala platform of 1890.[9] Other demands were for a law that would give a better labor system, for the sale of all public lands in small tracts to actual settlers on easy terms, for a provision that all lands held for speculation be valued for taxation at the same rates as they were offered for sale to cash purchasers, and for the abolition of the convict contract system. They were already committed to inflation, their plank upon this subject reading as follows: "We demand the rapid extinguishment of the public debt by operating the mints to their fullest capacity in the coinage of gold and silver, and tendering the same without discrimination to all public creditors." The propriety of parishes buying lands sold for taxes, and holding them for actual settlers, was suggested.[10]

The preliminary steps in the formation of the people's party in Louisiana were taken in Winn parish during the congressional campaign of 1890. Attention has already been called to the

and best educator of the farmers was the Alliance, which was founded on the broad principles of humanity and justice. It was a noble order, and its purpose and platforms pure and lofty. It was a friend of the producing classes, and led them up to a higher plane of enlightenment. It taught the farmers the benefits of association, and gave them lessons of far-reaching importance. Many a thrifty farmer owes his salvation from debt and penury to the holy teachings of the Alliance. Women and children were benefitted as well as the men. It contributed to the social pleasures and broke the monotony of farm life. Peerless, grand, beautiful order. How we would like to hear its songs again. How we would like to see the bright faces and the hearty welcomes of the brethren in council, sweet as the 'dews of Hermon and the oil that ran down on Aaron's beard.' "

[9] The Ocala platform is printed in the *World almanac,* 1891, 93-94.

[10] *Times-Democrat,* April 18, 1888.

earlier political activities of the farmers in north Louisiana. Prior to the nominations, the alliance men of the fourth congressional district, then composed of the parishes of Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, De Soto, Grant, Natchitoches, Rapides, Red River, Sabine, Vernon, Webster, and Winn, were backing a candidate who had the support of a majority of the delegates to the district nominating convention. Through trickery he was deprived of nomination, much to the anger and disgust of his supporters. The Winn parish delegation bolted the convention, went home, organized, and sent Hardy L. Brian to the leading alliance men in most of the parishes in the district in order to secure delegates to a convention at Natchitoches. This convention met and nominated T. J. Guice, of De Soto parish, lecturer of the state farmer's alliance, as an independent candidate for congress to oppose the nominee of the district convention. In the election Guice received only 5,167 votes to 16,442 polled by the regular candidate,[11] but the foundation for the people's party had been laid. During the campaign the farmer's alliance men of Winn parish bought out the only newspaper in the parish, the *Winn Parish Democrat*, and began the publication of the *Comrade* at Winnfield, the parish seat, which at that time was twenty-eight miles from a steamboat landing and thirty-five miles from a railroad. H. L. Brian, a man of energy and unusual ability, was chosen editor. He was the leader of the people's party in Louisiana, and, besides editing the chief newspapers of the party, served first as secretary and later as chairman of its state central committee.

By the time of the state campaign of 1892, the people's party was fully organized with a ticket in the field. Doubtless these developments were influenced by the Cincinnati convention of 1891, where Louisiana was represented by H. L. Brian of Winn parish and I. J. Mills of Calcasieu. At this point it may be well to mention some of the aims of the Louisiana people's party. As will appear from time to time, the party naturally adopted nearly all, if not all, of the principles of the national organization of which they formed a part, but particularly in the southern states they were interested in bringing about many purely local reforms. Among these may be mentioned the reform of the con-

[11] *World almanac*, 1891, 290.

vention system for nominating candidates for state offices. Delegates to such were apportioned among the parishes in proportion to the vote cast in previous elections. In the "swamp" or "black" parishes, it was customary to count the negro vote, never actually cast, in making these apportionments, and this enabled the aforesaid parishes to control the "white" or "hill" parishes. Another reform was in regard to the appointive power of the governor, the claim being made that offices went to the centers of greatest political influence, the "black" parishes, as rewards for faithful service, and that this worked to the detriment of the "white" or "hill" parishes. Besides, the governor was enabled to build up a strong machine, and thus perpetuate his authority.[12]

The great issue before the voters of the state in the election grew out of a movement, dating from the year 1890, for the renewal of the charter of the Louisiana state lottery company, which was to expire January 1, 1894.[13] Louisiana legislatures are chosen quadrennially, consequently the one elected in 1892 would be called upon to take action upon the application of the lottery company. The campaign was unusually exciting, for the election was regarded as of the greatest importance. The democratic party split into two factions, known as the anti-lottery and the regulars, with Murphy J. Foster and Samuel D. McEnery as their respective candidates for governor. Dissensions of some kind, apparently foreign to the great question of the day, had also divided the republicans into two groups, each with a candidate for governor. The election, held April 19, resulted in a victory for the anti-lottery forces, their candidate for governor having a plurality of over 30,000 votes. The people's party candidate for governor, R. L. Tannehill, sheriff of Winn parish and treasurer of the state farmer's alliance, received 9,792 votes, carrying the parishes of Catahoula, Grant, Vernon, and Winn.[14] These figures should not be taken as an indication of the numerical strength of the party at the time, however, for the state farmer's alliance had made a fusion agreement with the anti-lottery dem-

[12] For most of the facts concerning the origin and early development of the people's party in Louisiana I am indebted to Mr. H. L. Brian, of Verda, Louisiana.

[13] Alcée Fortier, *History of Louisiana* (New York, 1904), 4: 220-225.

[14] *Biennial report of the secretary of state of the state of Louisiana to the general assembly*, 1894-1896, 178-179.

ocrats, and this divided their vote.[15] During the election the people's party elected to the state senate B. F. Brian, a farmer from Grant parish.[16]

With the state election over, political attention in Louisiana was centered upon the approaching presidential campaign. There was great activity upon the part of the new party men. They sent a delegation to Omaha, Nebraska, that assisted at the nomination of James B. Weaver and James G. Field as the candidates of the national people's party.[17] In the early fall both candidates made a tour of the south, Field visiting and speaking at several places in Louisiana.[18] In the people's party parishes there was great enthusiasm for the Weaver-Field ticket, which, since Weaver had served in the union army and Field in the confederate, was referred to as a union of the blue and the gray. The attention that the democrat press gives to the movement at this time is evidence of its growing importance. Many of the small white farmers in the hill parishes of north Louisiana, long regarded as the democratic stronghold, were leaving the ranks of the old party and casting their lot with the new. Something must be done to put an end to the schism. Ridicule was resorted to, and General Weaver's military and political records were aired in order to discountenance him in the eyes of the voters. It was charged that the people of Tennessee, where he had held an important command during the late war, considered him the most bitter hater of the south in the whole union army, and as for his political record, he had been democrat, know-nothing, republican, and everything else he could be, in order to get votes and hold office.[19]

The Arkansas election was to take place September 5, and as the time approached, the democrats of Louisiana began to show a great interest, not unmixed with anxiety, in the outcome. Populism was known to be strong there and it was felt that the

[15] Statements by Mr. H. L. Brian and others.

[16] Mr. H. L. Brian informs me that three members of the party were also elected to the lower house, but they were probably candidates on the fusion ticket, and hence classed as democrats in the report of the secretary of state. *Biennial report of the secretary of state of the state of Louisiana to the general assembly*, 1892-1894, contains a table showing the composition of the legislature.

[17] *Daily Picayune* (New Orleans), July 3 and 5, 1892.

[18] *Times Democrat*, September 10, 1892.

[19] *Ibid.*, September 4, 1892.

vote would show not only the strength of the new party in Arkansas, but, to a certain extent, that it would afford some indication of its strength in the south as a whole. If it polled a large vote, the third party would become a factor in the November election, and the democrats would have to exert themselves to the utmost.[20] When the fateful day arrived, the official returns gave the election to the Arkansas democrats, but the joy of the Louisiana democrats over the result was tempered somewhat by news that during the contest in the neighboring state there had been a tacit understanding between the people's party and the republicans. This was regarded as an unfavorable development.[21]

On September 17, 1892, Weaver and Field issued, from Pensacola, Florida, what was called their letter of acceptance by a democratic newspaper of Louisiana; this paper charged that the letter had not been promulgated earlier because its authors wished to delay until they could make practical acquaintance with the wrongs suffered by the people of the south. The wrongs set forth in this document were, in substance, that the people were in poverty and that their substance was being devoured by heartless monopolists, that labor was largely unemployed, and that where work was obtainable the wages were unremunerative. The two great parties, it was set forth, were everywhere under the control of the great monopoly and money centers, and they had manifested an utter disregard for the people. The last point, which there is plenty of evidence to prove was true in Louisiana, called attention to the people's lack of confidence in the integrity of election judges.[22]

The letter was evidently a vote-catching device planned by the two candidates of the national people's party, who saw in the southern political situation an excellent opportunity to break the "solid south" with profit to themselves. Just what its immediate effects were, besides drawing the fire of the democratic press, it would be difficult to say. One thing that is certain is that heavy inroads were being made in the ranks of the democrats of Louisiana by the third party men. The democrats were torn by dissension, and hardly in a position to resist dis-

[20] *Ibid.*, September 5, 1892.
[21] *Ibid.*, September 7, 1892.
[22] *Ibid.*, September 20, 1892.

integration. "We are not in a condition now to permit internal dissention," warned the *Baton Rouge Advocate*. "The breaches must be closed and strengthened preparatory to a vigorous assault all along the line. An active, enthusiastic campaign must be at once inaugurated in order to carry the principles of Democracy victorious over the combined assaults of the Republicans and Populists. . . Oily-tongued orators, in many cases the paid agents of the Republican party have for months been circulating among the unsophisticated and more credulous classes, preaching their heresies and teaching the people that if Weaver is elected President money may be had for the asking, transportation on the railroad trains will be practically free, the laboring man will be transferred from his present position and placed upon a throne of power, while lakes filled with molasses, whose shores are fringed with buckwheat cakes, and islands of Jersey butter rise here and there above the surface, will be a concomitant of every farm. 'The forty-acres-and-a-mule' promises of the reconstruction era pale into insignificance beside the glowing pictures of prosperity promised by the average Populist orator to those who support Weaver. These issues must be met. It will not do to simply pooh pooh their absurdity."[23]

If literally true, this portrayal of the political situation throws interesting light upon Louisiana campaign methods, and, at the same time, stands as a sad commentary upon the intelligence of people who could be influenced by such promises. Much of it is, of course, pure exaggeration, but certain actual facts were pointed out. The new party had become a political force to be reckoned with. Its propaganda was being spread by speakers and by means of the press. But by far the most important thing alluded to was the understanding between the republicans and the people's party; this tendency to form a combination with the minority party was a characteristic of populism everywhere. In Louisiana the understanding was as yet merely tacit. Before it could very well develop into a formal alliance breaches in republican ranks had to be closed. There were two factions, known as the Leonard and Warmouth factions, each claiming to be the duly recognized representative of republicanism in the state. The struggle between them was exceedingly bitter. Two members of the republican national committee came to New

[23] Quoted in *Times-Democrat*, October 3, 1892.

Orleans and made a vain attempt to restore harmony between them.[24] Finally, they reached an agreement among themselves [25] and the way was clear for the alliance with the third party men. It is not clear which took the initiative but negotiations were carried on for some time. On October 15, 1892, there was published a proposition for fusion that was pending at that date,[26] but the actual agreement was not signed until the night of October 20. It provided for a combination electoral and congressional ticket. In the conduct of the fusion campaign every honorable means was to be used by each party to elect the entire ticket, "both the presidential electors and Congressional candidates, but when elected they shall not be under any pledge, one to the other, but shall in all matters stand relatively to each other the same as if elected by their respective parties, without the assistance of the other party to the contract." [27]

At the time this agreement was made public the campaign committees of the two parties each issued an address to the voters of the state. That of the people's party called attention to the baneful influence of monopolies, the hard lot of the common people, and the corrupt alliance entered into between those who usurped too great a share of the profits of the producers of wealth and professional politicians, which, it was stated, had destroyed the usefulness of both the two great political parties. It was charged that the state electoral machinery was in the hands of the democratic politicians, and that the republicans alone could not secure a fair count of the vote. By entering into the fusion agreement, it was asserted, the people's party was merely fighting the democrats with their own methods. In concluding, an appeal was made to the voters to have the manhood to assert their rights, not to let the scarecrow of negro domination longer drive them to the democratic wigwam, and to rally to the standard of the people's party and elect the fusion ticket as a rebuke to "the Democrats in their strength, and the Republican party in its weakness. May Louisiana break the 'solid south' and greet our great toiling brethren of the North and West with the cheering hope of industrial reform in the near future. A re-

[24] *Ibid.*, September 27, 1892.
[25] *Ibid.*, October 6, 1892.
[26] *Ibid.*, October 15, 1892.
[27] *Ibid.*, October 21, 1892.

form bringing with it the liberation of our producers of wealth from the dangers which threaten their further enslavement. A reform which will restore our government to what it was intended to be, 'one of the people, for the people, and by the people.'" The republican address merely announced the agreement, stated that it had been entered into against the common enemy, after due deliberation, and on the advice of national leaders, in order to secure a fair election, and it called upon the republican congressional district committees to give it their support.[28]

In the presidential election the democrats carried the state, a popular vote of 87,922 being cast for Cleveland. Weaver, the people's party candidate, led Harrison, the republican candidate, by a single vote, the former receiving 13,282, and the latter, 13,281.[29] The democrats also elected their whole congressional ticket.[30]

The people's party-republican fusion lasted through the congressional campaign of 1894,[31] the state campaign in the spring of 1896, up to the national free silver campaign in the fall of 1896. It created a formidable opposition for the democrats, and introduced a particularly disturbing factor: the negro, politically suppressed since reconstruction days, was now, owing to the trend of developments, courted for his vote. Fears of negro domination began to be expressed. The more responsible of the democrats were, naturally, among the first to take the alarm,[32] and as the time for the state election of 1896 drew near, they became convinced that then was the time for a settlement. Accordingly, the democratic legislature prepared a suffrage amendment to the constitution for submission to the voters. This, in addition to the usual age, state, parish, and ward or precinct qualifications, contained an educational clause, with a property qualification as an alternative. It was made the chief plank in the party platform. It was felt that a democratic victory at the polls, without other guarantees, would protect the white supremacy for only the next four years, but that if the negro won, if he defeated the amendment, it would require a revolution to

[28] *Times-Democrat*, October 21, 1892.

[29] Edward Stanwood, *History of the presidency* (Boston, 1898), 517.

[30] *Daily Picayune*, November 10, 1892.

[31] The democrats repeated their success of 1892 in this election. See *World almanac*, 1895, 402-403.

[32] *Times Democrat*, April 4, 1896.

wrest it from him in 1900.[33] Ex-Governor McEnery was of the opinion that the politicians were afraid to thwart the negro's caprice, and that "there is not in the whole state, with few exceptions, the moral courage to insist upon the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment regulating suffrage." He also stated that "if we are to have peace and quiet in this state, if we are to have a well organized government, if we are to have a virtuous society and intelligent, growing, progressive spirit, we will be compelled to restrict the right of suffrage to its intelligent exercise. The negro today is the dominant power in this state."[34]

The democrats nominated Governor Foster for reëlection. The fusionists put a full state ticket in the field, their candidate for governor being a republican, John N. Pharr, at one time a steamboat captain, and later temperance lecturer and planter.[35] They were not the only reformers participating in the spring campaign and election. Business and professional men of New Orleans, disgusted by exposures of graft and corruption due to ring politics, organized the citizen's league, and put up a ticket, headed by Walter C. Flower for mayor, in opposition to that of the regular democrats, then in control of the city government.[36] This caused the democrats of the state at large some concern, as did also the action of the sugar planters, who joined the republicans in 1896 because they feared that a national democratic victory would mean the end of tariff protection on sugar.[37]

The campaign was marked by much disorder and some bloodshed, the most serious outbreaks occuring in the parish of St. Landry, a strong populist center. Many of these grew out of registration troubles. It is alleged that after the sheriff failed to appear on account of threats against his life, republicans and populists took possession of the town of Washington, on April 3, and "went through the form of registering the negroes." Counter action was taken by organized bands of white men, presumably democrats, who, under the name of "Regulators," undertook to maintain white supremacy by whipping and killing

[33] *Ibid.*, April 5, 1896.
[34] *Ibid.*, April 13, 1896.
[35] *Ibid.*, April 21, 1896.
[36] *Ibid.*, April 2, 1896.
[37] *Ibid.*, April 9, September 21, 1896.

negroes in an effort to intimidate them. A few days after the affair at Washington, one of these bands met at a place called Grand Prairie, a number of negroes on their way to Opelousas to register for the election. An encounter took place in which two negroes were killed, several wounded, and many whipped. The situation became so serious that state troops had to be sent to maintain order in the parish.[38]

The state election, which took place April 21, was one of the most disorderly ever held in Louisiana. Charges of fraud, intimidation at the polls, and ballot-box stuffing were too numerous to mention. Twice the militia had to be called out to put down riots.[39] The democrats won as usual, but with greatly reduced majorities as compared with former elections. The legislature chosen, which was composed of thirty-six senators and ninety-eight representatives, contained two independents, two independent democrats, thirteen republicans, and eighteen populists, two of the latter being in the upper and sixteen in the lower chamber.[40] The citizen's league carried the New Orleans city election, and sent nineteen members of the organization to the legislature. True to ex-Governor McEnery's prediction, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated, and by methods characterized as disgraceful.[41]

One half the populists elected were classified as planters, seven were farmers, one was a lumber manufacturer, and one was a teacher. Eleven were native born citizens of Louisiana, four claimed Georgia as their place of birth, two were born in Alabama, one each in North Carolina and Tennessee, and one in Ireland. They were chosen from the parishes of Winn, St. Landry, Catahoula, Natchitoches, Sabine, Union, Jackson, East Baton Rouge, Claiborne, Lincoln, Grant, Vernon, and Acadia,[42] located for the most part in the northwestern, western, and southwestern sections of the state. These were the regions of great populist influence, but a heavy vote was polled by the party

[38] *Times-Democrat*, April 8, 10, 1896.

[39] *Ibid.*, April 23, 25, 28, 1896.

[40] *Biennial report of the secretary of state of the state of Louisiana to the general assembly*, 1894-1896, 6-13.

[41] *Times-Democrat*, April 25, 1896.

[42] *Biennial report of the secretary of state of the state of Louisiana to the general assembly*, 1894-1896, 6-13.

in some of the Florida parishes.[43] Their great stronghold was in the hill parishes of northwestern Louisiana, peopled mainly by small white farmers. This, it will be recalled, was the region where the farmer's alliance had been particularly strong, and where a heavy vote had been cast for the people's party candidate for governor in the state election of 1892. Populism never gained much of a foothold in the cotton parishes of the delta, or in the sugar parishes; and it was never strong in the cities.[44]

By far the most serious situation growing out of the election concerned the governership. The election officials gave out that Governor Foster had been reëlected by a large majority, but the fusionists absolutely refused to accept this result, claiming that it had been accomplished by means of false returns. They honestly believed that Pharr had carried the state, and they determined to seat him at all costs. Passions were at fever heat, and, except in times of war, it is doubtful if the people of Louisiana have ever been confronted with a graver crisis than that which developed during the three weeks following the election. The difficulty had to be settled, but how? The constitution provided no method. A grand jury undertook to investigate the election, but serious objections were raised to this mode of procedure, and it was abandoned.[45] Pharr's supporters maintained that the state legislature was the proper tribunal for the trial of the case, and that in exercising the functions of a court it had authority to go behind the election returns.[46] After considerable wrangling, they appear to have had their way, in part at least, for it was decided to leave the matter to the determination of the legislature just elected. This convened early in May; a bitter struggle then took place in the state capitol at Baton Rouge, while the city was filled with the armed partisans of both candidates. The citizen's league men from New Orleans split over the issue, one of them taking the lead in the effort to seat Pharr. The latter's followers were given an opportunity to present their case, but the legislature in joint session decided, by a vote of 87 to 74, that it did not have authority to go behind the election returns, and Governor Foster was declared reëlec-

[43] *Daily Picayune*, April 25, 1896.

[44] Statements by Mr. H. L. Brian and others confirm these conclusions.

[45] *Times-Democrat*, April 29, 30, 1896.

[46] *Ibid.*, May 3, 1896.

ted.[47] This decision, while far from being satisfactory to the fusionists, was, fortunately, accepted by them. Perhaps the strength of the armed forces arrayed against them had something to do with their acquiescence.

As has been seen, many citizens had already felt, prior to the state campaign and election, that it was necessary to eliminate the ignorant and vicious,— the ignorant negroes in particular, of course, — from politics; the excesses of April and May made them determined to do so. The press of the state for the most part came out strongly in favor of such action. Changes in the fundamental law of the state were required if such an end was to be attained. The constitutional method of amendment had just been tried without success, owing to the influence of the politicians. In order to avoid such influences in the future the legislature passed an act, approved July 7, 1896, providing for submitting to the voters of the state, for their approval or rejection, at an election to take place on the second Tuesday of January, 1898, a proposition for holding a convention at the city of New Orleans, on the second Tuesday of February, 1898, and giving it full authority to draw up and adopt a new state constitution without submitting it to the people. The convention was to consist of one hundred and thirty-four delegates, thirty-six of whom were to be chosen at large and ninety-eight in the parishes and representative districts. Certain prohibitions were to be placed upon the convention. It could not introduce into the new instrument of government any provision affecting the bonded indebtedness of the state, or of local political units, except under carefully specified conditions. It could not alter the existing levee system, change the terms of office of assemblymen, judges, or similar officers, or change in any way the constitutional prohibitions on lotteries. The act also contained directions on voting for delegates, and the oath to be administered to members of the convention.[48]

A new electoral law, likewise a product of the election — it may represent a sort of a compromise between the democrats and the opposition — was approved two days later, on July 9, 1896. In its twenty-five pages it made provision for the use of the Austra-

[47] *Times-Democrat*, May 15, 1896; *Times Picayune* (New Orleans), March 12, 1918.
[48] *Acts of the state of Louisiana*, 1896, no. 52.

lian ballot, in effect for the first time in Louisiana during the presidential election of 1896, and framed regulations regarding notices of elections, officials at the polls, the canvass and count of ballots, ballot-boxes, the delivery of ballots, and the giving of information to voters. Penalties were provided for infractions, and for having intoxicating liquors in polling places.[49]

The state election of 1896 marked the end of the republican-populist alliance in Louisiana. The presidential campaign in the fall of that year found most of the populists in hearty coöperation with the democrats. A common candidate for president and mutual interest in inflation made this a perfectly natural attitude. The populists of southwest Louisiana were reported as being in favor of Bryan and his free silver platform early in September,[50] but it was a very difficult matter to win over the men of north Louisiana, where memories of their treatment at the hands of the democrats in the spring still rankled in the minds of many. It required prolonged negotiations to arrange an agreement, but one was eventually reached at Baton Rouge, September 25, 1896. The democrats pledged themselves to a fair election, and conceded the populists one-half of the presidential electors.[51] It is probable that pressure from national populist headquarters was an important, if not the most important, influence back of this agreement.[52]

There was a new party in the field during the fall campaign and election in Louisiana, but it was not of sufficient strength to influence results very much. The adoption of the free silver plank by the democrats assembled in national convention at Chicago in the preceding summer had caused United States Senator Caffery, of New Orleans, to leave the convention and join the other bolters at Indianapolis. Here, as permanent chairman, he presided over the convention that organized the national democratic party with its gold standard platform.[53] His course of action was displeasing to country democrats in Louisiana, many of whom felt called upon to lecture him as to what constituted sound democratic doctrine. Some went so far as to

[49] *Ibid.*, no. 137.
[50] *Times-Democrat*, September 5, 1896.
[51] *Ibid.*, September 16, 24, 25, 26, 1896.
[52] *Ibid.*, September 27, 1896.
[53] Stanwood, *History of the presidency*, 558.

demand his expulsion from congress.[54] Upon his return to his home he took an active part in forming the national democratic party of Louisiana, its membership being composed almost entirely of residents of New Orleans, the business and financial center of the state.[55] The republicans tried to enter into a fusion agreement with the national democrats, but they refused for the reason, as Senator Caffery stated, that they were democrats and believed in democratic principles.[56]

Great interest was taken in the election, which was held November 3, although with the democrats and populists fused the result was a foregone conclusion. The republicans could not muster sufficient votes, even with the sugar planters, to overcome the combination, and the gold democrats were merely a handful. The popular vote of the state for president was 77,175 for Bryan, 22,037 for McKinley, while Palmer, the national democratic candidate, received but 1,915.[57] "We have had exciting campaigns before, but nothing like the present one, not even in the ugly days which immediately followed the Civil War," ran an editorial in the *Times-Democrat* while the contest was at its height, and it remarked that it was gratifying that New Orleans and Louisiana were escaping the extreme bitterness that characterized the campaign elsewhere.[58] Election day passed quietly.

The election for deciding whether or not a constitutional convention should be held, subject to the conditions laid down in the act of July 7, 1896, took place January 11, 1898, and resulted in a vote of 36,178 for, and only 7,578 against the proposition. The convention, accordingly, met at the appointed time and place. Nearly all the delegates were democrats, there being present only a few republicans and one populist, B. W. Bailey of Winn parish.[59] The result of their work was the Louisiana constitution of 1898, which is remarkable for its elaborate provisions regulating suffrage and elections. Ignorant voters were to be excluded unless they owned and paid taxes on property

[54] *Times-Democrat*, September 21, 1896.
[55] *Ibid.*, September 11, 22, 23, 1896.
[56] *Ibid.*, October 3, 1896.
[57] Stanwood, *History of the presidency*, 567.
[58] October 26, 1896.
[59] *Biennial report of the secretary of state of the state of Louisiana to the general assembly*, 1896-1898, opposite p. 32.

assessed at three hundred dollars or over. The most important clause in this connection, section 5 of article 197, provided that "no male person who was on January 1, 1867, or at any date prior thereto, entitled to vote under the Constitution or statutes of any state of the United States, wherein he then resided, and no son or grandson of any such person not less than twenty-one years of age at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, and no male person of foreign birth, who was naturalized prior to the first day of January, 1898, shall be denied the right to register and vote in this State by reason of his failure to possess the educational or property qualifications prescribed by this Constitution: provided he shall have resided in this State for five years next preceding the date at which he shall apply for registration, and shall have registered in accordance with the terms of this article prior to September 1, 1898, but no person shall be entitled to register under this section after said date." This is the famous "grandfather clause," the first of its kind; by inventing and adopting it Louisiana showed the other southern states how to disfranchise the negroes without interfering with the white voters. Two other constitutional changes merit attention: the governor was made ineligible as his own successor, and limitations were placed upon his power of appointment by making the important state officers elective.

The presidential election of 1896 marked the beginning of the end of populism in Louisiana; from that time on the third party men gradually returned to the democratic organization. This was probably due in part to reviving prosperity, but the fact that the electoral law of 1896 and the constitutional convention of 1898 had redressed most of their local grievances should not be overlooked. The people's party had a candidate for governor in the state election of 1900, Donelson Caffery, son of Senator Caffery, but they gave him only 4,938 votes. He failed to carry a single parish; even Winn went democratic. The election was a sweeping victory for the democrats; they elected their candidate for governor, William W. Heard, and every member of the legislature.[60] The populists never put a ticket in the field after 1900.

New Orleans, Louisiana Melvin Johnson White
Tulane University

[60] *Report of the secretary of state to his excellency W. W. Heard, governor of the state of Louisiana,* May 12, 1902, 564.

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN

Considering the difficulties of his task, the completeness of his responsibility for its accomplishment, and its far-reaching results, Stephen F. Austin has claims to being the greatest colonial proprietary in American history.

He was born in Wythe county, Virginia, November 3, 1793, moved to Missouri at the age of five, spent four years (1804-1808) at different Connecticut schools and two at Transylvania university, and at the age of seventeen returned to Missouri, with schooling complete, to plunge into his father's complex business, a part of which he took over in 1817. In 1813 he was elected to the territorial legislature of Missouri, and by successive reëlections served until 1819; in 1815 Governor Clark gave him an adjutant's commission in the Missouri militia; in 1818 he became a director in the ill-fated bank of St. Louis; two years later Governor Miller appointed him judge of the federal circuit of Arkansas; and at the beginning of 1821 he was editing a newspaper at New Orleans.[1] With training and experience of such breadth and versatility and with his intimate knowledge of frontier life, Austin at twenty-eight was well prepared to be the founder and patriarchal ruler of a wilderness commonwealth.

He embarked with his father somewhat dubiously upon the colonization of Texas,[2] and it was partly in obedience to his father's dying wish that he determined to continue the undertaking alone.[3] But having begun, he spent himself in singular

[1] The statements in this paragraph are drawn from a sketch of Moses Austin, written by Stephen F. Austin, and one of Stephen F. Austin, written by his nephew, Colonel Guy M. Bryan, in *A comprehensive history of Texas* (Wooten ed. — Dallas, 1898), 1: 439-447. I have confirmed all of them from contemporary documents, except dates of service in the Missouri legislature.

[2] "I can now go forward with confidence and I hope and pray you will discharge your Doubts as to the Enterprise." Moses Austin to Stephen F. Austin, May 22, 1821, Austin papers, university of Texas. "I myself believed that the probabilities of failure or success were almost equal." Austin to Wharton, April 24, 1829, Austin papers.

[3] "He called me to his bedside and with much distress and difficulty of speach beged me to tell you to take his place and if god in his wisdom thought best to dis-

devotion to the healthy growth of Texas and the welfare of the colonists whom his influence brought to the country and for whose prosperity he felt a personal responsibility. In moments of despondency, when particularly harassed by public duties and anxieties, he longed for a "small farm, a moderate independence, and a wife,"[4] but for the most part he had no time for thoughts of self. His conception of his task extended farther than the mere planting of a number of families in an uninhabited waste; it was to create there a high-toned, intelligent, prosperous, and happy society. "Such an enterprise as the one I undertook in settling an uninhabited country," he wrote in 1832, "must necessarily pass through three regular gradations. The first step was to overcome the roughness of the wilderness, and may be compared to the labor of the farmer on a piece of ground covered with woods, bushes, and brambles, which must be cut down and cleared away, and the roots grubbed out before it can be cultivated. The second step was to pave the way for civilization and lay the foundation for lasting productive advancement in wealth, morality, and happiness. This step might be compared to the ploughing, harrowing, and sowing the ground after it is cleared. The third and last and most important step is to give proper and healthy direction to public opinion, morality, and education — to give tone, character, and consistency to society, which, to continue the simile, is gathering in the harvest and applying it to the promotion of human happiness. In trying to lead the colony through these gradations my task has been one of continued hard labor. I have been clearing away brambles, laying foundations, sowing the seed. The genial influences of cultivated society will be like the sun shedding light, fragrance, and beauty."[5] Ten years of retrospect no doubt helped him to formulate this statement of his purpose, but it is perfectly clear that his aim was in mind from the beginning. To another correspondent he wrote: "My ambition has been to succeed in redeeming Texas from its wilderness state by means of

appoint him in the accomplishment of his wishes and plans formed, he prayed him to extend his goodness to you and enable you to go on with the business in the same way he would have done." Mary Austin, mother of Stephen, to Stephen F. Austin, June 8, 1821, Austin papers.

[4] Austin to W. C. Carr, March 4, 1829, Austin papers.

[5] Austin to his cousin, Mrs. Mary Austin Holley, January 14, 1832 (copy), Austin papers, in file of July, 1831.

the plough alone, in spreading over it North American population, enterprise and intelligence, in doing this I hoped to make the fortunes of thousands and my own amongst the rest. . . I think I derived more satisfaction from the view of flourishing farms springing up in this wilderness than military or political chieftains do from the retrospect of their victorious campaigns. My object is to build up, for the present as well as for future generations. . . I deemed the object laudable and honorable and worthy the attention of honorable men."[6]

In some ways the time was ripe for his undertaking in 1821. The westward movement had crossed the Mississippi and reached the borders of Texas, and the panic of 1819 and the reorganization of the land system of the United States in 1820 coöperated to stimulate emigration to lands that combined the attractions of princely abundance, accessibility, fertility, and cheapness that amounted in effect to a free gift. Austin's greatness, therefore, consists not in having overcome difficulties of transportation and communication to induce reluctant colonists to reclaim a distant and inhospitable land, but in the tact with which, on the one hand, he governed his independent western frontiersmen, curbing their intolerance of the "foreigner" and their disgust at his political ineptitude, while on the other, he won and held the confidence of Mexican statesmen, soothing their fear of disloyalty of the colonists and the ultimate absorption of Texas by the United States. Austin stated his problem in a very few words in a letter of 1829: "I had an ignorant, whimsical, selfish and suspicious set of rulers over me to keep good natured, a perplexed, confused colonization law to execute, and an unruly set of North American frontier republicans to controul who felt that they were sovereigns, for they knew that they were beyond the arm of the Govt. or of law, unless it pleased them to be controuled."[7]

Fortunately, though it seemed to him ruinously unfortunate at the time, the revolution and the political upheaval incident to the establishment of Mexican independence carried Austin to Mexico in the spring of 1822, after many of his colonists had already arrived, and kept him there for a year securing confirma-

[6] Austin to Wharton, April 24, 1829, Austin papers.
[7] *Ibid.*

tion of his grant, which had been made by the Spanish régime. There, during the brief space of eleven months, he saw the executive government go through the stages of a regency, an empire, and a military triumvirate — Iturbide elevating himself to the imperial throne by Napoleonic methods and being himself overthrown by Santa Anna posing as a liberal — while the legislature traveled through a provisional *junta gubernativa*, a sovereign elected congress, a rump (the *junta nacional instituyente*), and back again, after the fall of Iturbide, to the congress. With little money, and reduced at last to the extremity of selling his watch, Austin possessed his soul in such patience as he could and gently nagged a national colonization law through Iturbide's rump parliament, only to have it annulled on the return of the legitimate congress by its sweeping decree repealing all acts of the empire. He had won his case, however, and congress instructed the executive to confirm his contract in the terms of the imperial law. Incidentally he had learned the language, gained the confidence and esteem of such men as Anastacio Bustamante, Lorenzo de Zavala, Ramos Arispe, and Lucas Alaman, and obtained an insight into Mexican personal and official character that was the key to his future success. For a foreigner he had exercised a remarkable influence upon the shifting committees of the various legislative bodies. He was largely responsible for the passage of the colonization law,[8] tried his hand at drafting an imperial constitution which combined some of the features of the constitution of the United States with the Spanish constitution of 1812,[9] and, on his departure, left with Ramos Arispe a document[10] which probably in considerable degree shaped the

[8] "I can without boasting say that my constant Exertions and importunity with the Members both directly and indirectly through my friends produced this law." Austin's explanation to the colonists concerning charges for land, June 5, 1824, Austin papers, miscellaneous. See also Austin to Governor Trespalacios, January 8, 1823, Austin papers.

[9] Draft in English with partial translation into Spanish, March 29-30, 1823, Austin papers, miscellaneous. There are also in this collection: "Plan for organization of Congress for the Empire of Mexico," August, 1822, and "Reflections Addressed to the Junta Instituyente," January 16, 1823.

[10] "Plan de las bases organicas y fundamentales para el establecimiento de una Republica federada en el Anahuac." This is endorsed by Austin: "Copy of a Plan by S. F. Austin in May 1823 in Monterrey translated by Mercado, and delivered to Ramos Arispe and the Comdt, General Felipe de la Garza — both of whom were at that time in Monterrey." The document shows interlineations and suggestions in

acta constitutiva, the provisional constitution which bridged the transition from empire to federal republic.

Austin returned to Texas with extraordinary powers. The governor had already invested him with general authority to govern the colony until the regular state administration could be extended to it,[11] and now, by decree of the national government, this power was more specifically defined and extended. He was supreme judge, save that in capital cases he must submit his decision to the commandant general of the eastern interior provinces before execution; he could issue regulations for the government of the settlements when the national laws did not apply; he was commander of the militia, which it was his duty to keep in an efficient state of organization, with the title of lieutenant-colonel, and with authority to wage offensive and defensive war on the Indians;[12] he had sole power to admit immigrants to or exclude them from his colony, which covered an area larger than Massachusetts; and, acting with a commissioner appointed by the governor, he could give title to married men for 4,600 acres of land, subject to improvement in two years, and could greatly augment that amount to men with large families, or to those who established gins, sawmills, or other public conveniences.[13]

Most of this power Austin retained for seven years. The legislature, it is true, was organized in 1824, when Texas was united with Coahuila to the south, but, aside from passing the state colonization law, its attention until 1827 was centered on

Arispe's hand, and he added: "I think it very important that this plan be immediately printed." Austin himself believed that the plan "had much influence in giving unity of intention and direction to the Federal party." As he says, "Arispe was the chairman of the committee who drew up the Acta Constitutiva, and a comparison of that act with this plan will show a very striking similarity." *A comprehensive history of Texas*, 1: 490. The document is in Austin papers, miscellaneous. In an article in the *Southwestern historical quarterly*, 20: 19-27, Marion John Atwood emphasizes the Spanish sources of the *acta constitutiva*. I have not as yet had the opportunity to study the influence of Austin's draft.

[11] For these powers, see Martinez to Austin, August 24, 1821, in *A comprehensive history of Texas*, 1: 472; Austin to Garza, May 27, 1823, and Garza to Austin, June 16, 1823, Spanish records, 54: 84, and Translations of the records, 1: 14, in general land office, Austin, Texas.

[12] Documents in *A comprehensive history of Texas*, 1: 473-475.

[13] Austin's power to grant lands in his colony is defined in the imperial colonization law of January 3, 1823, for which see *Laws of Texas* (Gammel ed. — Austin, 1898), 1: 27-30.

the formation of the constitution, so that there was very little legislation for Texas. A local *ayuntamiento* or municipal government was established in 1828, but for several years this took little of the burden of administration from Austin, because, though he steadily refused to accept office in the *ayuntamiento*, the members of that body looked to him for guidance and both state and federal authorities showed a disposition to hold him responsible for the smooth working of the local government. Of the land system he retained direction throughout the colonial period. From inclination as well as from necessity, he followed democratic methods of administration, dividing the colony into districts and allowing the inhabitants to elect *alcaldes*, or justices of the peace, and militia officers, himself hearing appeals from the former and directing the latter. But in the matter of legislation he acted alone, promulgating, with the approval of the political chief at San Antonio, a brief civil and criminal code which was in operation for five years. In his management of the lands of the colony he followed from the beginning the practice of issuing titles only on official surveys and of recording in permanent form all papers connected with the title, including the surveyor's plat of the land. The government made no allowance for the expenses of administration, and in the early days taxation was impossible, so that, except for fees of *alcaldes* and constables, the cost of government fell heavily upon Austin. This was particularly true of his management of the land business, while he was at constant expense also in entertaining travelers and prospectors, sending expresses, giving presents to Indians, and often furnishing munitions and supplies for Indian campaigns.[14]

Anticipating some of these expenses, and wishing also, naturally, compensation for his industry and enterprise, Austin had, before planting a single colonist, arranged, with the knowledge of Governor Martinez, to collect twelve and a half cents an acre for the land in his grant, assuming himself the cost of surveying and of issuing and recording titles. He advertised this in plain and unambiguous terms, and the original settlers accepted it gladly, because elsewhere in Texas they had no right to settle or acquire land at all. The imperial colonization law of

[14] For this paragraph see Eugene C. Barker, "The government of Austin's colony," in *Southwestern historical quarterly*, 21: 223 ff.

1823, in accordance with whose terms, after its repeal, Austin's grant was confirmed, greatly enlarged the headrights which he had planned to allow settlers and provided that he himself should receive as compensation for his labors some 65,000 acres for each two hundred families that he introduced. Whether this was intended to annul the twelve and one-half cent agreement is open to question. Austin thought not, and so explained on his return from Mexico in the summer of 1823. Where each settler could have 4,600 acres for the asking, the *empresario's* 65,000 acres were not likely to yield much ready money for current expenses. Nevertheless, some of the colonists now objected to the payment and carried their complaint to the political chief, who had replaced the governor at San Antonio, and he ruled against Austin's right to charge for the lands. Instead, he fixed a scale of fees for the surveyor, the land commissioner, and the state which Austin thought had no warrant in law. Austin contented himself, however, with making a straightforward defense of his reasons for charging the fee, pointing out the risks, hardships, sacrifices, and expenses he had suffered, and asking plainly if he had not given in labor and responsibility the equivalent of the twelve and a half cents an acre which the colonists had agreed to pay him, or whether they could or would have obtained anything, except through his exertions. Many considered themselves in equity bound by their contracts, one declaring that no candid man in the colony denied the obligation, but Austin relinquished all the contracts and made an arrangement with Bastrop for a division of the fee which the political chief had prescribed for the latter as commissioner. It yielded much less than his contracts with the colonists would have done, but it avoided friction both with them and the political chief. The colonization law which the legislature passed in 1825 recognized the justice of Austin's position and authorized *empresarios* to collect a fee from their settlers in addition to the generous premium of land allowed by the state.[15]

A few of the colonists were already grumbling because they saw Austin granting three, four, and five leagues to some while

[15] *Ibid.* See also a very excellent discussion of the same subject by Lester G. Bugbee, "Some difficulties of a Texas empresario," in *Publications of the Southern history association*, April, 1899, 97-101.

he allowed them only a paltry 4,600 acres. They were ignorant of Spanish and knew nothing of his powers except what he or his secretary and the commissioner Bastrop told them. Might he not be imposing upon them and exploiting them for his own advantage? Had he any authority either to grant land or govern the colony? The political chief's interference in the matter of the fees helped to strengthen their suspicion, and uneasy whispers increased to a respectable rumble of discontent. The political chief assured them that Austin's authority was ample in every respect, but the excitement subsided slowly and did not disappear until Austin convinced the leaders of his power by arresting them and threatening to send them to San Antonio for trial. The threat and a heart to heart talk were sufficient, and they soon became his staunchest supporters.[16] Austin ascribed much of his trouble to the colonists' ignorance of the language, their exercise of the sacred American right to abuse a public official, and the absence of definite laws. "You know," he wrote in 1825, "that it is innate in an American to suspect and abuse a public officer whether he deserves it or not. I have a mixed multitude to deal with, collected from all quarters, strangers to each other, to me, and to the laws and language of the country. They came here with all the ideas of Americans and expect to see and understand the laws they are governed by, . . . Could I have shown them a law defining positively the quantity of land they were to get and no more and a code of laws by which they were to be governed I should have had no difficulty—but they saw at once that my powers were discretionary, and that a very great augmentation to their grants could be made, and thus the colonization law itself and the authority vested in me under that law holds me up as a public mark to be shot at. . ."[17] With the readiness of the colonists to "growl" and "grumble" and "mutter," "without knowing why, or without being able to explain why," as he said, he was not, however, disposed to quarrel. "It arose," he thought, "from a principle which is common to all North Americans, a feeling which is the natural offspring of the unbounded republican liberty enjoyed by all classes in the United States; . . . jealousy of those in office,

[16] *Ibid.*, April, 1899, 101-109; Barker, "The government of Austin's colony," in *Southwestern historical quarterly*, 21: 223 ff.

[17] Austin to Edwards, September 15, 1825, Austin papers.

jealousy of undue encroachments on personal rights, and a general repugnance to everything that wore the semblance of a stretch of power."[18]

Another duty that brought Austin some enemies and much annoyance was that of keeping criminals and men of bad character out of the colony. He required certificates of character from all who obtained land, and though in the nature of things these certificates could be hardly more than formal statements of "parties unknown," he made remarkably few mistakes.[19] He banished several from the colony in 1823 and 1824 under threat of severe corporal punishment, and in one case applied the lash. Some of the exiles took refuge in the neighboring colony of the Mexican *empresario* De Leon and avenged themselves by making false reports about Austin to the government, and others settled in the no man's land on the borders of Louisiana and Arkansas and deterred honest emigrants from proceeding to Texas by tales of violence and anarchy. To an enquirer alarmed by such stories in 1829 Austin wrote: "in proportion to our numbers, we are as enlightened, as moral, as good, and as 'law abiding' men, as can be found in any part of the United States, and greatly more so than ever settled a frontier"—an opinion the substantial accuracy of which the historian must confirm.[20] For, besides the fact that the immigrants were under a

[18] Austin to White, March 31, 1829, Austin papers. This letter was published by the university of Texas in the *Texas history teachers' bulletin*, February, 1917, 41-45.

[19] "No person will be admitted as a settler who does not produce satisfactory evidence of having supported the character of a moral, sober, and industrious citizen." From a printed permit (1821) to settle in Austin's first colony. Austin endeavored to have immigrants present testimonials from the justice of the peace or some other local official of their former residence in the United States, but this was not always possible, and it is evident that many were received on the recommendation of settlers already in the colony,—on very short acquaintance, one may suspect. There is abundant evidence, however, that Austin tried to give this requirement a real meaning. See, for example, entries in "Register of families in Austin's colony," in general land office, Austin, Texas: "John H. Jones, single man, wants a place below tract where John Williams lives . . . and as he is an entire stranger I have required him to produce me satisfactory evidence of his moral conduct" (p. 16); "Henry Martin, Mary his wife, 1 male child, 3 female children . . . has presented no recommendations—his reception as a colonist is to be subject to future evacuation—no certificate is issued to him, and it is entirely optionary with the empresario to receive him or not" (p. 18).

[20] Bugbee, "Some difficulties of a Texas empresario," in *Publications of the Southern history association*, April, 1899, 109-113; Austin to White, March 31, 1829, Austin papers.

supervision which good policy as well as law required, the great majority, especially of the earlier colonists, were men of family seeking homes, not speculators or adventurers. The state colonization law of 1825 put a premium on marriage by allowing married men four times as much land as unmarried men, while Austin had previously required ten single men to unite into a "family" to obtain a league, the headright of a married man.

It would be impossible to exaggerate Austin's labors in the early years of the colony. A letter to the political chief in 1826 gives a clue to their character and variety. He had left San Felipe on April 4 to point out some land recently conceded to one of the state officials and had been detained by excessive rains and swollen streams until April 29. On May 1 he had begun the trial of an important case that had lasted seven days; at the same time he had had to entertain a delegation of the Tonkaway Indians and make preparations for a campaign against another tribe; to talk to and answer questions of many "foreigners" who had come to look at the country, explaining and translating the federal constitution and some of the laws for them; to receive and pass upon applications for land, hear reports and issue instructions to surveyors; and to correspond with superior civil and military officers. This, May 8, his first free day since returning, was mail day, and he had received two communications and dispatched five.[21] Too much of his time, he once complained, was consumed in settling "neighborhood disputes about cows and calves,"[22] but it was the patience with which he devoted himself to the minutiae of the colony as well as his intelligence and ability in more important things that accounts for his success. During these years he gathered by painstaking surveys and personal observations data for a map of Texas, published by Tanner in 1829; charted Galveston bay and the several harbors and navigable rivers of the state; promoted trade with the United States and kept a stream of immigrants flowing into the colony; encouraged the erection of gins and sawmills and the establishment of schools; and exercised throughout a most remarkable influence over the legislature at Saltillo in matters affecting the interest of the colony. To mention but a few instances of this, he was responsible in consider-

[21] Austin to political chief, May 8, 1826, general land office, Austin, Texas, 54: 26.
[22] Austin to Bell, April 16, 1830, Austin papers.

able degree for the liberal terms of the colonization law, his arguments prevented the constitutional abolition of slavery in 1827 and secured the labor law of the next year permitting the continued introduction of slaves in the form of indented servants, and in 1829 his desire to protect the colonists against suit for debts contracted before coming to the country found expression in what we should now consider a somewhat sweeping homestead law. He himself was a member of the legislature in 1831-1832, and was reëlected in 1834 but was prevented from serving by his detention in Mexico.[23]

Burdened as he was with the affairs of his own colony, he found time to answer the calls of others. He repeatedly exerted himself to obtain titles for families who had drifted in and settled on the eastern border of the province before the passage of the colonization law; and he was always ready to give other *empresarios* the benefit of his knowledge and experience. DeWitt was deeply indebted to him for such success as he enjoyed, Burnet drew heavily upon him, and Edwards received advice that ought to have saved him from the folly of the Fredonian rebellion. He perceived very clearly the mutual interest of all in the peaceful and rapid development of Texas, and, with the field so vast and the laborers so few, he welcomed every additional effort in the promotion of that end. Some of his fellow-*empresarios*, however, without his vision and interest in the permanent growth of the country, doubted his sincerity and blamed him for embarrassments and failures due to their own impatience, greed, and unwillingness to adapt themselves to Mexican racial characteristics and sensibilities. What was needed in Texas, he said, was "*men*, . . . not open mouthed politicians, nor selfish visionary speculators, nor jealous ambitious declamitory demagogues who will irritate the public mind by inflamitory criticisms about temporary evils and by indulging in vague surmises. We need men of enlightened judgement, disinterested prudence, and reflection, with a great stock of patience, unshaken perseverence and integrity of purpose. Men who will calmly put their shoulders to the wheel and toil for the good of others as well as for their own, and who will be contented to rise with the country without [trying] to force it forward prema-

[23] Each statement in this paragraph is based on abundance of manuscript sources in the Austin papers.

turely to overtop the genl. level of prosperity by undue individual advancement. A band of *such* men firmly linked together by bonds of mutual confidence and unity of purpose and action could and would make Texas the garden of North America."[24]

He did not, of course, as we have seen, escape misconstruction by his own colonists, but this he philosophically recognized as inevitable and even necessary, in a way, to the success of the colony. "To have been universally popular amongst the settlers for the first two or three years," he said, "would have endangered all, for it would have excited vague jealousies in the [fear?] alone that I was conciliating popular favor in order to wield it in a particular way. To have been universally unpopular endangered all in another way, for it would have totally destroyed that degree of popular confidence and character abroad which was necessary to draw emigration and it would also have deprived me of the power of controuling the settlers sufficiently to have prevented them from destroying themselves. . . The reflecting and worthy part of the settlers have always adhered to me firmly throughout. [The other class] abused me over their grog and at times have had weight enough to require humoring and management to keep within bounds, but they effectually removed all suspicion that I was courting the favor of a rabble for the purpose of wielding it, and in this they did me and the colony a service, though without knowing or intending it, and I used their abuse of me to advance the public good and establish myself more firmly in the confidence of my rulers."[25] He was conservative in declaring that the "reflecting and worthy part of the settlers" adhered to him, and they were always a vast majority. They brought him their personal troubles and perplexities, and surrendered completely to his guidance in every crisis through which the colony passed. This was true in 1826, when he led them against Edwards' rebellious "frontier republicans" at Nacogdoches; in 1829, when he obtained the exemption of Texas from President Guerrero's emancipation decree; in 1830, when he reconciled them to the federal decree limiting immigration from the United States, while taking steps to secure its suspension; in 1832, when, after the expulsion of Bustamante's gar-

[24] Austin to Wharton, April 24, 1829, Austin papers.
[25] *Ibid.*

risons from Texas during his absence, he convinced Colonel Mexia of their loyalty to the liberal party of Santa Anna; in 1833, when they petitioned for the separation of Texas and Coahuila and sent him to Mexico to urge its approval; and, finally, in 1835, when they resisted Santa Anna's encroachments on republican government, for without his advice and organizing influence very few would have been ready then to take up arms. The revolution once begun, he was called to the command of the army, much as Washington went to Cambridge, to quiet the claims of rival aspirants, and when order was established and the campaign under way they sent him to the United States to find money and munitions to maintain it.

His control of the settlers in every essential movement as they increased from a few hundred in 1821 to many thousand in 1835 proves him a great leader. The confidence of Mexican officials despite their innate fear of Anglo-American expansion, which was constantly stimulated by the efforts of the United States to acquire Texas, proves him a diplomat of no mean ability. With both, his success was due to his absolute honesty and fearless candor.

His one purpose was the advancement of Texas. "I feel," he said only a few months before his death, "a more lively interest for its welfare than can be expressed — one that is greatly superior to all pecuniary or personal views of any kind. The prosperity of Texas has been the object of my labors, the idol of my existence — it has assumed the character of a *religion* for the guidance of my thoughts and actions for fifteen years."[26] He sincerely believed until the beginning of 1836 that the best interest of Texas lay in its loyalty to Mexico, that the colonists and the government had, therefore, a common interest in its development, and he was the efficient apostle of that faith. He felt some fear of the outcome of republican government in Mexico, he knew that the people were not fitted for it, but hoped that they might stumble along until education and experience prepared them for it.[27] At the same time, as a prudent man would in his position, he sometimes contemplated a condition of anarchy or oppression that would render continued loyalty im-

[26] Austin to General E. P. Gaines, July 27, 1836, Austin papers.

[27] Austin to Carr, March 4, 1829, Austin papers.

possible. In such a contingency, though he shrank from it, he favored independence; never, until shortly before his death, was he in favor of annexation to the United States. As an "independent speck in the galaxy of nations," he wrote in 1829, "Europe will gladly receive our cotton and sugar etc. on advantageous terms in exchange for 'untariffed' manufactured articles. We should be too contemptible to excite the jealousy of the Northern mammoth, and policy and interest would induce Europe to let us alone. I deem it to be more than probable that the great powers would all unite in garanteeing the Independence of little Texas. There are many powerful reasons why it would be to their interest to do it."[28] On his attitude toward annexation there is an abundance of material from 1830 to 1835, and there can be no doubt of his sincerity.[29] This conclusion does not rest alone on an interpretation of Austin's own statements, for in 1834 Anthony Butler attributed to him his failure to buy Texas.[30] Two reasons for opposing annexation Austin gives: the land system of the United States and slavery. "If that Govt. should get hold of us and introduce its *land* system, thousands who are now on the move and who have not yet secured titles would be totally ruined. The greatest misfortune that could befall Texas at this moment would be a sudden change by which any of the emigrants would be thrown upon the liberality of the Congress of the United States of the North."[31] This he wrote to his brother-in-law in 1830. A few months later he wrote that he "should oppose a union with the United States without some *guarantees*, amongst them I should insist on the perpetual exclusion of slavery from this country."[32] No doubt the tariff figured in his consideration, and it is evident, too, that he believed that a strong population in Texas would ultimately wield such an influence with the government as to be freer under Mexico than under the United States.[33]

Austin's views on slavery, despite the quotation just read, and

[28] Austin to Wharton, April 24, 1829, Austin papers.

[29] On Austin's attitude toward independence see article by Barker in the *Quarterly of the Texas state historical association*, 13: 257-284.

[30] Butler to McLane, July 13, 1834, state department manuscripts, despatches from agents to Mexico, volume 6.

[31] Austin to Perry, March 28, 1830, Austin papers.

[32] Austin to Henry Austin, June 1, 1830, Austin papers.

[33] See, for example, Austin to Wharton, April 24, 1829, Austin papers.

a number of other expressions equally unequivocal, require explanation. He successfully opposed constitutional emancipation in 1827, urged in vain at the same time that immigrants be permitted to continue bringing slaves from the United States, obtained the withdrawal of Guerrero's emancipation decree in 1829, and declared in 1835 that Texas must be a slave state. The contradiction is more apparent than real, but when all is said some inconsistency remains. The truth seems to be that he did deplore slavery, but that he recognized its economic necessity in the development of Texas. Most of his colonists were naturally to be expected from the neighboring slave states, but slave owners would not come if forbidden to bring their slaves, and others who did come would be greatly hampered by the absence of free labor. About the time of this letter he seems to have felt that a satisfactory compromise might be reached by the labor law of 1828, which, in effect, established the peonage system of Mexico. He wrote in 1831, "Negroes can be brought here under indentures, as servants, but *not as slaves.* This question of slavery is a difficult one to get on with. It will ultimately be admitted, or the free negroes will be formed by law into a separate and distinct class—*the laboring class.* Color forms a line of demarkation between them and the whites. The law must assign their station, fix their rights and their disabilities and obligations—something between slavery and freedom, but neither the one nor the other. Either this or slavery in full must take place. Which is best? Quien sabe? It is a difficult and dark question."[34] In 1832 the labor law was modified, limiting contracts thereafter to ten years,—hence, perhaps, his declaration for slavery in 1835. His defense of existing slavery in 1826-1827, it should be added, was based on what he considered guaranteed vested right, his original contract with the Spanish government, under which his first families were introduced, having recognized slavery by augmenting a settler's headright in proportion to the number of slaves he owned.[35]

I have tried to present in this short paper something of the personality of Austin as he revealed himself in his work. He was a grave, gentle, kindly man, charitable, tolerant, affection-

[34] Austin to Mrs. Holley (copy), July 19, 1831, Austin papers.

[35] There is much material on the subject of this sentence; see for example Austin to *ayuntamiento* of Bexar, August 14, 1826, general land office, 57: 96.

ate and loyal, naturally impulsive but restrained by habit, sensitive, lonely, and given too much, perhaps, to introspection. He enjoyed social companionship, but his position set him apart from the colonists and made close friendships with them difficult and rare. He smoked, danced now and then, loved music (he played the flute in his younger days), and his bills show occasional charges for whiskey, brandy, and wine. He was well educated, widely read for his opportunities, and a clear thinker. His letters in their straightforward precision and naturalness remind one of Franklin. He worked incessantly, unselfishly, and generally most patiently. In short, he appears to me a lovable human character, with many charming qualities.

On returning from his mission to the United States in the summer of 1836 he was persuaded to be a candidate for the presidency. He consented with indifference[36] and took his defeat by Houston with equanimity. He had been absent from the country for the better part of three years on public business, part of the time in a Mexican prison; his personal affairs were greatly neglected, and he welcomed the prospect of leisure to put them in order. However, when his victorious rival asked him to be secretary of state, he consented, in the belief that he could be useful in bringing the infant republic to the favorable notice of the older governments. As usual he immersed himself in public duties to the utter neglect of self; and died from overwork and exposure on December 27, 1836. For fifteen years he had held the destiny of Texas in the hollow of his hand, and, characteristically, his last conscious thought was of its welfare. He waked from a dream thinking that the United States had recognized its independence, and died in that belief.[37] His death thus, at the age of only forty-three, on the eve of the fruition of all his labors, with the country redeemed from the wilderness and others assuming the burden of responsibility that had deprived him of home, wife, and family, is one of fate's grim ironies — a distressing personal tragedy.

Eugene C. Barker

University of Texas
Austin, Texas

[36] Austin to Gail Borden, Jr. [August, 1836], Austin papers, miscellaneous.

[37] George L. Hammeken, "Recollections of Stephen F. Austin," in *Southwestern historical quarterly*, 20: 380.

TERRITORIAL LEGISLATION BY GOVERNOR AND JUDGES

The ordinance of 1787 contained a remarkable provision for legislation in the northwest territory until it should reach a population sufficient to entitle it to the second grade of government with an elected assembly and legislative council. This provision was that "the Governor and Judges, or a majority of them, shall adopt and publish in the districts such laws of the original states, civil and criminal, as may be necessary and best suited to the circumstances of the district, and report them to Congress from time to time which shall prevail in said district until the organization of the General Assembly, unless disapproved of by Congress."

The same provision was carried into the governments provided by congress for the territory of the United States south of the river Ohio in 1790, for the territory of Mississippi in 1798, Indiana in 1800, Michigan in 1805, and Illinois in 1809, and this extraordinary form of legislative body, uniting the executive and judiciary in a legislature, lasted for periods ranging from two years in the case of Mississippi, to nineteen years in the case of Michigan. A survey of the way in which this system worked, violating as it did the fundamental principle of the separation of powers, may be of interest.

NORTHWEST TERRITORY

The same congress which adopted the ordinance of 1787, on October 5 following elected Arthur St. Clair governor, and Winthrop Sargent secretary of the new territory, and on October 16 elected three judges,—Samuel Holden Parsons, John Armstrong, and James Mitchell Varnum, thus completing the organization. It was not until July 15, 1788, however, at Marietta, that the governor together with two of the judges—Parsons and Varnum—met for the first time in the capacity of a legislature.

The first legislative act was entitled "A law for regulating

and establishing the militia . . . By his Excellency Arthur St. Clair Esquire, Governor & Commander in chief & by the honourable Samuel Holden Parsons and James Mitchell Varnum Esquires, Judges."[1]

This act did not purport to be adopted in whole or in part from the laws of any one or more of the original states, nor was it in fact so adopted. It was drawn by Judges Parson and Varnum and passed as an absolutely original act. A few days later the same judges sent to the governor a draft of a bill relating to estates held in common, and on July 29 the governor replied, severely criticising the proposed law; this apparently ended the project. In the letter Governor St. Clair expressed a doubt whether the existing legislature was competent to originate such a law, as they were empowered only to adopt laws.[2]

He further said: "I suspect we are overpassing the line of our duty in forming new laws in any case; and when we do, the necessity of the case only can be our justification. The Ordinance of Congress empowers us to adopt and publish such laws of the original States, criminal and civil, as may be necessary and best suited to the circumstances of the district. In departing from that rule, we certainly expose ourselves to censure from Congress, and besides, there may be some doubt of the validity of such laws as we adopt and publish under any other. . .

"I agree to the militia law fully, under the impression of these sentiments, because the necessity of self-defense must supersede other considerations."[3]

To this the judges replied on the following day discussing at some length the question whether in the adoption and publication of laws they were literally confined to the laws of the old states; they were of the opinion that a strict and liberal construction of the ordinance would defeat its purpose. In a new colony many prospects and objects arose to which old countries

[1] *Laws of the territory of the United States northwest of the Ohio river, passed at the first session of the general assembly begun and held at Cincinnati, on Monday the 16th day of September A. D. 1799; also certain laws enacted by the governor and judges of the territory from the commencement of the government to December 1792* . . . (Cincinnati, 1800), 1833.

[2] *The St. Clair papers: the life and public services of Arthur St. Clair, soldier of the revolutionary war; president of the continental congress; and governor of the Northwest territory; with his correspondence and other papers* (Smith ed. — Cincinnati, 1882), 2: 67.

[3] *Ibid.*, 2: 68.

were strangers. The clause in question admitted of two constructions; one, that they could adopt entire laws of any of the old states, *literatim et verbatim, mutatis et mutandis*, for their state only; the other that they could take such parts of any particular law as were necessary, and by inference, different parts of different laws of two or more states upon the same subject and in that event the diction should be rendered uniform. The element of necessity referred to in the governor's letter could have no application if a literal construction were to be followed.

In view of all the conditions they came to the conclusion that they were entitled to adopt such laws as were necessary and best suited to the district, provided they were not repugnant to the laws of original states or of some one or more of them. All laws adopted by them were subject to the negative of congress and to the necessity that the governor and two of the judges, or that all of the judges should agree.[4]

On August 7 the governor replied to these contentions in a long letter. He had a high conception of the governor's position and dignity, and the suggestion in the judges' letter that a law might be adopted by the three judges without the governor did not at all meet with his approval. While conceding that the punctuation in the ordinance favored the judges' construction, he believed that congress intended that the assent of the governor should be necessary to the adoption of any law, and that the phase in question should be construed as if it read:

"The Governor and the judges, or a majority of them, provided the Governor be one of that majority, shall [adopt and publish laws], etc." He also strongly dissented from the position that they had power to make a law consisting of different parts of laws of different states and to change the diction.[5]

This ended open differences on these matters, and no further question about their powers was raised until May, 1795, when the governor and two judges — Symmes and Turner — met at Cincinnati, and between May 28 and August 26 adopted and made thirty-five laws, most of them purporting to be adoptions from the Pennsylvania code, and being the first laws of the territory which followed the ideas of the governor.[6]

[4] *St. Clair papers*, 2: 70.
[5] *Ibid.*, 2: 74.
[6] *Ibid.*, 2: 353.

This session was preceded with a lengthy address by the governor to the judges, and a reply by them. In his address the governor alluded to his interchange of views with the former judges upon their powers to adopt or make laws, and he adhered to the views then expressed by him which he argued had received a confirmation in the fact that at the last session of congress the house passed a bill disapproving the acts passed in 1792, which failed to pass the senate only because that body considered the acts void without any action on the part of congress.[7] He therefore advised a repeal of all the laws which had been passed, and the adoption of new ones from some or all the original states. Judges Symmes and Turner replied promptly that they had always been of the opinion that the language of the ordinance was properly capable of the construction that the governor and judges had the power either to adopt or make laws, but in view of his report of the action of congress and its sentiments they were willing to meet him on the ground of adoption only of laws. From a reiteration in his address of his claims to negative an act, they dissented absolutely.[8]

Eleven laws were passed at a legislative session held in April and May, 1798; these were the last legislative acts of the governor and judges, as the territory passed to the second grade of government the following winter.

In accordance with the provisions of the ordinance the laws of the territory were sent to the government at Washington; those passed in 1788 and 1790, in the winter of 1791-1792, and on February 22, 1792, they were laid before the house of representatives. On February 27 they were referred to a special committee,[9] and on March 5 the laws passed in 1791 which had in the meantime been received at Washington were referred to the same committee.[10] The report of the committee was considered on March 23 and the bill ordered to be brought in to carry out the report.[11] On May 8 this bill was passed by the house, sent to the senate, passed there, and approved the same day by the president.[12]

[7] In this statement the governor was mistaken. See below.
[8] *St. Clair papers*, 2: 363 ff.
[9] *Annals of congress*, 2 congress, 1 session, 428.
[10] *Ibid.*, 2 congress, 1 session, 434.
[11] *Ibid.*, 481.
[12] *Ibid.*, 601, 140.

This act disapproved and thereby nullified an act passed by the governor and judges December 27, 1788, and by necessary inference, since all the laws passed up to that time were considered, approved all the others. It may be well to notice that the law disapproved of was opposed, not because it was a law *made* instead of *adopted*, but because it provided a statute of limitation on certain actions which would not operate fairly and uniformly.

On January 21, 1794, the laws passed in 1792 were sent to congress and in the senate were referred to a committee which on April 18 recommended that they be referred to the next session of congress; this was done.[13]

In the house the committee to which the laws were referred reported May 24, 1794, in favor of disapproving all the laws on the ground that they were passed by the governor and judges "on the idea that they were possessed generally of legislative power and either have not in whole or in part been adopted from laws of the original states."[14] Congress adjourned until the following November before any action was taken on this report.

The house considered the report on February 12, 1795, and amended it by excluding all reference to the reasons stated in the report.[15]

On February 16, a joint resolution disapproving all the acts except one, but without stating any reason therefor, passed the house and was sent to the senate; there it was referred to a special committee which on February 21st reported in favor of the senate's not concurring in the resolution, and on the same day the senate adopted the report which disposed of the matter.[16] The fifteenth of January, 1799, a resolution was offered in the senate for the appointment of a committee to examine the laws adopted in the northwest territory and to report how far they were "authorized or expedient," and on January 18, a committee was appointed to examine the laws and report how far they were "expedient,"[17] but no report was ever made or any further action taken. This was the last time the acts of the gov-

[13] *Annals of congress*, 3 congress, 1 session, 84.
[14] *American state papers: miscellaneous*, 1: 82.
[15] *Annals of congress*, 3 congress, 2 session, 1214.
[16] *Ibid.*, 380.
[17] *Ibid.*, 5 congress, 3 session, 2202-2203.

ernor and judges of the northwest territory were acted upon in any manner by congress.

MISSISSIPPI TERRITORY

The act creating Mississippi territory was approved April 7, 1789; Winthrop Sargent, then secretary of the northwest territory, was appointed governor and William McGuire, Peter B. Bruin, and Daniel Tilton, the judges. The governor left Cincinnati for his new post about July 1, arriving at Natchez August 6. Judge Bruin lived in the territory, but Judge Tilton did not arrive until January, 1799, and Judge McGuire not until the July following. Two judges, however, together with the governor were sufficient to constitute the legislative body, and the first legislative act bears date February 28, 1799, and is entitled "A law establishing militia." It does not purport to be taken from or based upon the laws or code of any other state.

In a letter written March 13, 1799, to Timothy Pickering, secretary of state, Governor Sargent said: "We are at length legislating, but destitute of the laws of the several states, we necessarily make instead of adopting them, the right to which has heretofore been a question."[18]

Judge Tilton left for his former home in May, 1799, and Judge McGuire arrived in July; the second legislative session began the following September. In the spring of 1800 Judge Tilton returned, and on May 5 the third legislative session was held, on which occasion the governor formally addressed the legislature, consisting of himself and the two judges, in a written message. In the meantime for various reasons an active opposition to the governor had arisen; a convention was held and an agent appointed to present to congress the dissatisfaction of those represented in the convention, and January 13, 1800, a petition was presented to the house of representatives stating that the form of government which had been enacted by congress for Mississippi territory was bad in theory and worse in practice: that the executive, legislative, and judicial authorities, carefully separated and limited by the constitutions of the older states, were mingled in the hands of three or four individuals, and that this

[18] *Mississippi territorial archives, 1798-1803* (Rowland ed. — Nashville, 1905), 1: 110.

immense power had not been exercised with liberality or beneficence, and in some instances the provisions of the ordinance and of the constitution of the United States had not been followed. The petition prayed that although the territory lacked the number of inhabitants necessary to entitle it, under the ordinance, to the second grade of government, congress would adopt the legislation needed to permit it to take this step at once.[19] Various complaints had also been made directly to the governor that he and the judges had wrongfully undertaken to frame laws instead of adopting them from other states.

In his message the governor took the opportunity to refer to these matters, and said that he would not hesitate to concur in making any statutory laws, although he would prefer exact adoption from any of the original states when such provision would sufficiently apply.[20]

On one occasion Judges Bruin and Tilton drafted, signed, and sent a bill to the governor for his approval. He returned it with his express disapproval, however, and the judges seem to have accepted his position as fatal to the bill, for it was never treated or published as a law.

On June 15, 1800, Governor Sargent wrote a long letter to John Marshall,[21] then secretary of state, referring fully to the various charges in the petition in regard to the special charge of making instead of adopting laws, he said: "We began legislating with the Laws of the Northwestern Territory only — They had been long subject to the disapprobation of the Honourable Congress and *daring* not to doubt their attention we believed them good."

In another letter to Marshall on August 25,[22] he returned to the charge that the governor and judges were "making" laws, and said that they were very willing to admit it; that he, as secretary of the northwestern territory and acting governor, had fully concurred with the judges that they were a complete legislative body; that they never hesitated to manifest this to congress, and that the laws which had been enacted there as early

[19] *American state papers: miscellaneous*, 1: 203.
[20] *Mississippi territorial archives*, 1: 231.
[21] *Ibid.*, 1: 243.
[22] *Ibid.*, 1: 268.

as 1788 demonstrated this, and that these laws which were regularly transmitted to the general government were only disapproved in one solitary instance, thus evincing the perfect confidence of congress with them in sentiment upon that very important subject. And as further evidence that this attitude was the proper construction of the ordinance he cited the fact that in 1792 congress passed an act referring to the laws "that have been or may hereafter be enacted by the Governor and Judges," which provided that the governor and judges were "authorized to repeal their laws by them made" and therefrom inferred their most incontestible right to the very essential and statutory measure of enacting as well as adopting laws.

Two months before this, however, on June 24, congress had passed an act providing a legislative body for the territory, and no further meetings of the governor and judges were held.

The laws passed prior to June, 1799, were sent to Washington and transmitted by the president February 14, 1800, to the house of representatives, which referred them to the committee having in charge the petition and remonstrances from Mississippi territory. On May 8 the committee reported a resolution recommending the disapproval of two of the laws.[23] The next day the resolution was passed and sent to the senate, which on May 12 referred it to a committee; this body the next day reported an amendment which recited the provision in the ordinance conferring legislative power and drew therefrom the conclusion that the governor and judges could only adopt and publish existing laws from state codes; as it plainly appeared that these laws had been *enacted*, not *adopted*, it was important to correct such a practice, and the amendment accordingly provided that all the acts enacted from the commencement of the territory to June 30, 1799, should be disapproved.[24] The senate, however, disagreed to the amendment, and postponed further consideration until the next session;[25] it never again took it up.

On January 1, 1801, the president sent to congress the laws passed by the governor and judges from June 30 to December 31, 1799, but no action was taken by either house.

[23] *American state papers: miscellaneous*, 1: 214.
[24] *Annals of congress*, 6 congress, 1 session, 182.
[25] *Ibid.*

In all, thirty-nine laws were enacted by the governor and judges of the Mississippi territory, all violating the technical letter of the ordinance, but having the tacit approval of congress.

SOUTHWEST TERRITORY

This territory was created by act of May 26, 1790. On June 17, 1790, the president appointed William Blount governor, and David Campbell and John McNairy judges of the new territory. They did not meet in legislative session for more than two years, and their first legislative act was passed November 20, 1792. A second act was passed March 13, 1793.

Although the territory did not pass to the second stage of government until December, 1793, the above were the only acts passed by the legislative body, and in those no reference was made to their being adopted from the codes or laws of other states.

On February 7, 1794, the law passed March 13, 1793, together with three ordinances, was sent by the president to congress. In the senate it was referred to a select committee which recommended on February 11 that "Congress do not disapprove of the same," and the senate agreed to this report.[26] In the house no action was taken. The first act was never brought to the attention of congress.

INDIANA TERRITORY

Indiana territory was created by an act of congress May 7, 1800, with a government similar in all important respects to that of the northwest territory of which it had formed a part. William Henry Harrison, who had been secretary of the northwest territory since the departure of Sargent to Mississippi, was appointed governor, and William Clark, Henry Vanderburg, and John Griffin, judges. Their first legislative session was held at Vincennes January 12, 1801, continuing until January 26, when they adjourned, having adopted seven laws and three resolutions.

All the laws except the repealing acts purported to be adopted from some state code or from the codes of more than one state.

Five of the laws used the codes of two states and one those of three states. Virginia was the favorite, eleven laws being taken

[26] *Annals of congress*, 3 congress, 1 session, 43.

in whole or in part from that state. Pennsylvania came next with five laws in part or whole to its credit, followed by Kentucky with three and New York and northwest territory each with one.

Other legislative sessions were held in 1802-1803. September 11, 1804, Governor Harrison issued a proclamation that Indiana had passed into the second grade of government, and no further legislative sessions of the governor and judges were held.

On February 14, 1803, the president sent to congress the laws of Indiana passed from January, 1801, to February, 1802. In the same year, December 8, the president sent all the laws which had been adopted since the last communication, but in neither house was any action taken.

MICHIGAN TERRITORY

Michigan territory was created by act of January 11, 1805, but by the terms of the law the new government did not take effect until July 1 following. The president appointed General William Hull governor, and as judges, Samuel Huntington, A. B. Woodward, and Frederick Bates. Huntington did not accept and John Griffin, then judge in Indiana was appointed; he did not take office, however, until the following year.

The first legislative session began July 2, 1805, with the governor and two judges present, and ended October 8, 1805; during this time thirty-four laws were adopted. The question arose early in the session whether they were limited to adopting laws from the thirteen original states, or might use the laws of any of the states which came into existence before the territory of Michigan was created, and Judge Woodward, to whom the question was referred, brought in a report which was adopted favoring the latter view.[27]

The position insisted upon by Governor St. Clair of the northwest territory that the governor's affirmative vote was necessary to the adoption of any law did not meet with favor in Michigan and in one instance at least a law was adopted against the express disapproval of Governor Hull.[28]

The second legislative session was held beginning September

[27] *Michigan pioneer and historical collections* (Lansing, 1892-), 8: 603.
[28] *Ibid.*, 31: 563.

6, 1806, and between that date and the cessation of political powers caused by the capture of Detroit in 1812 ninety laws were adopted. In many of the statutes each section ends by "The same being adopted from the laws of the original states, to-wit, the states of.....and.....as far as necessary and suitable to the circumstances of the Territory of Michigan," and in other cases the clause above quoted appears only at the end of the law.

In many, if not most cases, this phrase was an empty one and did not express the real facts, which were that the act was really drawn to fit the supposed needs of Michigan and was independent of any other law or code, although it might be based upon some of the same general ideas. It is undoubtedly true that all the words used in any section could have been found in the laws of the states referred to, but in any proper sense it was untrue. A citizen of Detroit, very hostile to the governor and judges, wrote to the *Pittsburgh Commonwealth* in 1807 the following amusing description of the way in which the governor and judges prepared the laws. "They parade the laws of the original states before them on the table and cull letters from the laws of Maryland, syllables from the laws of Virginia, words from the laws of New York, sentences from the laws of Pennsylvania, verses from the laws of Kentucky and chapters from the laws of Connecticut; as far as suitable to the circumstances of Michigan."[29]

The problems arising out of the construction of the language of the ordinance giving legislative powers had been realized by the governor and judges and under the leadership of Judge Woodward had been boldly faced and settled. While in Washington, after the first legislative session, Judge Woodward wrote to Madison, secretary of state, in May, 1806, that in legislating they had construed the ordinance to mean: first, the governor was merely a member of the legislative body, with the same powers—and no more—as those of other members; second, the word "laws" included parts of laws, hence it was not necessary for the legislative body to adopt the whole of a law from one state—it might take different parts of the same law from different states; third, the word "necessary" gave them the power of omitting any part of a law whatever; fourth, the words,

[29] *Pittsburgh Commonwealth*, September 16, 1807.

"suited to the circumstances of the district" entitled them to change in many particulars any law they might adopt; fifth, "original states" meant all states existing when Michigan became a territory. Under this construction of powers their actions were consistent.[30]

Congress, however, had had before it at that time for several months the views of the governor and judges upon the subject of legislation. The total destruction of Detroit by fire just before the new government arrived naturally brought about conditions which existed nowhere else, and called for legislation by congress regarding titles in the settlement. On October 10, 1805, Governor Hull and Judge Woodward united in a report to President Jefferson, who laid it before congress December 23.[31]

In the report they took occasion to say that the strict *adoption* of any code or even of any one law was impossible. The possession of all the codes, if it were possible, and a complete acquaintance with them would prove ineffective, or in many very simple cases a strict precedent would be searched for in vain. A desirable object must often be abandoned for want of a precedent that would apply and often, if attempted, might be defeated from a want of a strict correspondence between the law made and the precedent from which it professed to be adopted. The real security, after all, rested in the control of congress which could correct any law which gave dissatisfaction.

Congress never expressed any dissent from these principles and the governor and judges might well have thought, after the attention of congress had been so clearly challenged to this view of the matter, that they were justified in continuing their course in legislating. In fact, congress disapproved but one act passed by them, and it took that action, not on account of the method of enactment, but entirely because the *particular* law met with financial and banking opposition within the outside of congress.

On January 5, 1807, the president laid before both houses of congress the laws which had been passed in Michigan during 1805.[32] In the senate they were referred to a select committee which reported four days later recommending that the senate

[30] *Michigan pioneer and historical collections*, 31: 562.

[31] *American state papers: public lands*, 1: 247.

[32] *Annals of congress*, 9 congress, 2 session, 27.

should not disapprove of the laws, but no action was taken;[33] in the house the laws were referred to a select committee which took no action.[34] The laws passed in 1806 were received from the president February 12 and referred to the same committee.[35] On February 24, Mr. Quincy of the committee presented a bill disapproving of the act adopted September 19, 1806, incorporating the Detroit bank;[36] four days later this bill was considered, passed, and sent to the senate,[37] which passed it March 3. No other action was taken by congress upon any laws passed by the Michigan governor and judges, and that body continued to legislate until a legislative council was provided by act of congress in 1823. The last legislative act of the governor and judges in Michigan, and the last one in any part of the United States, was the adoption of a law June 3, 1822, signed by Governor Cass and Judges Woodward and Witherell; strangely enough it did not purport to be adopted from the laws of any state.

ILLINOIS TERRITORY

This territory was created by act of congress, approved February 3, 1809; on March 7 of that year President Madison commissioned Nathaniel Pope of Louisiana territory, secretary in and for the Illinois territory, and in the absence of Governor Edwards, who did not receive his commission until April 24, Pope began his official duties on April 28, 1809.

The first legislative act in the territory was on June 13, 1809, when the governor and two of the judges passed a resolution declaring the laws of the Indiana territory to be in force in Illinois. The same body passed three laws June 16 and one on June 19. During July eight laws were passed, two of which purported to be adopted from the Kentucky code. Another law was passed December 22. During 1810 twelve laws were passed of which four were repealing laws, two were adopted from the Kentucky code, two from the Virginia code, and two were apparently framed without reference to any state laws.

In 1811 the legislature passed eight laws, of which two were

[33] *Annals of congress*, 29.
[34] *Ibid.*, 253.
[35] *Ibid.*, 482.
[36] *Ibid.*, 619.
[37] *Ibid.*, 657.

repealing acts, two were adopted from Kentucky, one from Pennsylvania, one from South Carolina, and two were not adopted from any state. The last legislative act of the governor and judges was taken November 29, 1811,[38] although the territory did not pass to the second stage of government until late in the following year; members of the assembly being elected in October and the first meeting of the elected legislature being held at Kaskaskia November 25, 1812. None of these laws were reported to congress.

It will be observed that the practice in Illinois regarding adoption of laws varied. Out of 33 laws passed, 14 were adopted and in each such instance the law purported to be adopted from the code of some one particular state.

The last government to have a legislature constituted of a governor and judges was that of Michigan, which ended in 1824, and that territory was the only one whose legislative acts passed by governor and judges ever came before the courts for judicial construction as to the extent of the power granted by the ordinance of 1787.

In December, 1817, the governor and judges of Michigan passed an act incorporating the bank of Michigan. It purported to be adopted from the laws of New York, Ohio, and Massachusetts, but in fact was drawn to meet the situation in Michigan, and had only a general resemblance to any law in any one of the three states specified.

The bank began business in January, 1819, and was a successful and important institution for more than twenty years. In February, 1828, it brought suit in Albany, New York, against John R. Williams, its first president. The chief defense was that the act incorporating the bank was not valid; that it was a law enacted, not adopted from the laws of other states as required by the ordinance of 1787. Thus there was brought into controversy the very point which had been debated in the Northwest, Mississippi, and Michigan territories.

The circuit court having decided in favor of the bank, the case was appealed to the supreme court of the state; it affirmed the decision of the lower court.[39]

[38] *Laws of the territory of Illinois, 1809-1811* (*Bulletin of the Illinois State Historical Library*, volume 1, number 2).

[39] *5 Wend.*, 480.

The defendant removed the case to the court of appeals where it was heard in 1831.[40] Several opinions were filed, but all agreed in the result which was affirmance of the decision of the supreme court.

The opinion of Senator Sherman considered the meaning of the words "enact" and "adopt" and the claim that the governor and judges had power only to adopt a law entire from the laws of one state, but concluded that if they did not adopt a law containing greater powers than was contained in the laws from whence it was taken, they were within the limits of their powers.

The only case in the United States courts in which was considered the question of legislative power granted by the ordnance of 1787 was the case of Peck *v.* Pease, decided in 1853.[41] In the course of the opinion Judge McLean said: "Under the first grade of the territorial government of Michigan, the governor and judges were authorized by the ordinance of 1787 to 'adopt' laws of the original states, for the government of the territory, and the law in question seems to have been adopted from the state of Vermont. They had no legislative power, consequently they had no power to modify or alter the laws they adopted."

As under the facts of this particular case the decision did not depend upon a statute passed by the governor and judges, the language quoted was really only a dictum and cannot be considered binding authority.

William L. Jenks

Port Huron, Michigan

[40] *7 Wend.*, 539.

[41] *5 McLean (U. S.)*, 486.

HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN THE OLD NORTHWEST

The normal expectation of a reduced activity along historical lines as a result of American participation in the world war is scarcely borne out by an actual survey of this field. So firmly have the foundations of serious historical study been laid that the carefully planned programs of historical agencies which have gradually established their place in the work-a-day world are not easily disturbed. Equally important, perhaps, is the fact that a new use has been found for such organizations as the channel for an important national service in connection with the great upheaval.

ORGANIZATION, LEGISLATION, AND EQUIPMENT

It was even found that states without an official historical agency were handicapped in the performance of full patriotic service. As a result of the suggestions of the national board for historical service, reënforced by the recommendations of the Ohio valley historical society and by local agencies, Governor James M. Cox of Ohio appointed an Ohio historical commission of twenty-three members headed by A. M. Schlesinger to direct the work of collecting and preserving materials bearing upon the part played by Ohio in the world war. Wisconsin, already organized for aggressive work along historical lines, even strengthened its organization in order to meet the new need. The state council of defense provided for a war history commission whose function is that of gathering for permanent preservation all the material that can be obtained relating to Wisconsin's share in the war. The state hopes to live up to its reputation of possessing the most complete collection of historical materials relating to the civil war of any state in the union. Plans have been made whereby the commission expects to coöperate with county councils of defense, local libraries, historical societies, and schools in this work of collecting and preserving materials. The chairman of the commission is M. M. Quaife, director of the state historical society; John W. Oliver of the same organization has been named director of the commission.

The Michigan historical commission has closed its fifth and most successful year. The commission now has a fairly well organized series of publications which are issued in editions of 2,500 copies and distributed free to the libraries and schools of Michigan and to such institutions outside the state as have arranged for exchanges. Within the last year George N. Fuller has been given the title of secretary and editor and Floyd Streeter has been promoted to the position of archivist. The fifth annual report of the commission may be found in the January, 1918, issue of the *Michigan history magazine*, (pages 54-57).

The Indiana historical survey continues its activities along established lines. The department of Indiana history and archives is arranging for the calendaring of the Lasselle and Tipton collections of manuscripts this spring and summer.

The war has interfered only slightly with the celebration of centennial anniversary of the admission of the state of Illinois into the union. The Illinois centennial commission has assigned charge to Hugh S. Magill and he has aroused local interest throughout the state in the various features of the anniversary. A patriotic color has been given to the celebration by linking the past of the state with present day conditions and problems. The portrayal of episodes in Illinois history in pageantry is under the direction of Wallace Rice, who has been appointed pageant-writer. The five volume centennial history of Illinois will appear before the close of the year. Three of the volumes have already gone to press and a second issue of the preliminary volume surveying conditions in *Illinois in 1818*[1] appeared in January, 1918. This edition and the centennial history has been placed in the hands of a publisher under contract to furnish the work to the general public at the cost of publication.

Early in the year the Illinois catholic historical society was organized with a view of gathering together material for the history of the state, especially as regards the part the Catholics have taken in the discovery, exploration, progress, and development. William J. Onahan is president of the new organization, which has its headquarters in Chicago; the *Illinois Catholic historical review* has been inaugurated under the editorial direc-

[1] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 396-398.

tion of Joseph J. Thompson, of Chicago. The Jewish historical society of Illinois has created a centennial celebration committee which is directing the preparation of a *Centennial history of the Jews of Illinois.* The Illinois state medical society is undertaking to compile an *Illinois state medical history.*

ACQUISITION OF SOURCE MATERIAL

The state historical society of Wisconsin reports a library of 409,848 titles on September 30, 1917, the increase for the preceding year having been 12,559 items. Besides a number of minor groups of manuscript accessions, the society acquired an important collection of private papers of Henry Demarest Lloyd, one of the active social reformers of the later nineteenth century. A large collection of the papers of Increase Allen Lapham, the naturalist, has been added to the library. The society has also been aggressive in its collection of material pertaining to Wisconsin's part in the European war. It has recently secured a photostatic machine of the largest size with the view to copying the files of early American newspapers, particularly those published in the middle west. An arrangement has been made with the Missouri historical society for the reproduction of all files of Missouri newspapers still in existence down to the year 1825. Mr. Quaife hopes to be able to offer to the branch of the historical profession dealing with middle-western history the same sort of service that the Massachusetts historical society has been furnishing to eastern scholars.

The Western Reserve historical society has added to its library a number of bound volumes of newspapers, including the *Cleveland Register* for 1818, the *Cleveland Herald*, 1818-1825, the *Buffalo Evening Post*, 1851-1866, the *New Richmond* (Ohio) *Philanthropist*, 1836-1838, the *Ravenna Star*, 1832; and the *Zanesville Visitor*, 1837-1838. The more notable manuscript items secured by this organization are the private papers and correspondence of Theodore E. Burton, as yet unclassified; a collection of some 2,000 General Braxton Bragg papers which include a letter from C. L. Vallandigham to General Bragg asking permission to enter the confederate lines and the official correspondence concerning this case, and secret confederate reports bearing on the organization of the union armies; a col-

lection of early Cleveland material principally concerned with John Walworth; twenty-two letters and documents bearing on Blennerhassett-Burr affairs; and a chest full of records of the Atlantic and Great Western railroad.

The Indiana historical survey has systematized its scheme for the collection of newspaper material. The survey now receives and binds one paper from each county of the state; it has added 200 volumes during the year.

The Illinois historical survey of the university of Illinois has acquired a large collection of photostatic copies and manuscript transcripts from the French archives in Paris. The collection now numbers some 3,000 photostats and about 2,100 transcripts. All these pertain to the early history of the Mississippi valley. The survey has also purchased a set of transcripts from the archive of the Indies, Seville, relating to Spanish Louisiana, the Mississippi valley, and the revolutionary war. These documents are being purchased from Mr. Charles H. Cunningham of Austin, Texas, who has already furnished 5,300 pages and is planning to supply approximately 500 pages a month. The survey has also acquired a collection of clippings covering various phases of the labor movement, particularly in Chicago, since 1870. One of the most important recent gains for historical research in Illinois is an arrangement with the trustees of Union Academy of Anna, Illinois, by which the Charles M. Willard newspaper collection of the academy was placed on deposit with the survey collections at Urbana. These newspapers include early nineteenth century files from New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and the southern states, besides several important Illinois and Missouri items.

PUBLICATION OF SOURCE MATERIAL

The most important new venture of the year in the publication of source material is represented by the *Marietta college historical collections*[2] which was launched in 1917 under the editorial direction of Archer B. Hulbert. Thus far the records of the original proceedings of the Ohio company have been issued in two volumes. A third volume entitled *Ohio in the time of the confederation* is progressing toward completion. To

[2] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 390-392.

make possible this important undertaking the Marietta historical commission was organized; the commission, of which Mr. Hulbert is chairman, acts as the publisher of the *Collections.* The *Quarterly publication of the historical and philosophical society of Ohio* contains some "Letters of Thomas Boylston Adams," a reprint of J. H. Daviess' "View of the president's conduct concerning the conspiracy of 1806," and some "Selections from the William Greene papers." Tract number 97 of the Western Reserve historical society prints fifty-seven letters and three contemporary maps from the John May collection of manuscripts under the title, "Side lights on the Ohio company of associates." They are edited with an introduction by Elbert J. Benton. The Buffalo historical society has in preparation a volume of the journal and letters of Samuel Kirkland, missionary to the Seneca and Oneida, United States government agent, and founder of Hamilton college; with the society is coöperating Hamilton college. *The Mexican war diary of George B. McClellan,*[3] which has been edited by W. S. Myers (Princeton, 1917. 93 p.), suggests something of the typical experiences of the troops from the middle west who served in the Mexican war.

The publication activities of the Wisconsin historical society have gone forward with their customary dispatch. Volume 24 of the *Collections, Frontier retreat on the upper Ohio, 1779-1781*[4] has been edited by Louise P. Kellogg (Draper series, volume 5, Madison, 1917. 459 p.). Volume 25 of the *Collections,* entitled *An English settler in pioneer Wisconsin,* comprising the papers of Edwin Bottomley, a pioneer farmer of Racine county, has been edited by M. M. Quaife and is just about ready to appear. (Madison, 1918). The second volume of the calendar series of the Draper collection, listing the thirty-four volumes of the Kentucky series, has been sent to the printer. A "Constitutional series," a civil war volume or two, and a volume of source material pertaining to Indian treaties in which Wisconsin was more or less directly concerned are among the projects being carried forward by the society at the present writing.

The publication of *Manuscripts from the Burton historical*

[3] Reviewed *ante,* 4: 381-382.

[4] To be reviewed later.

collection[5] has been continued under the editorship of M. Agnes Burton. Numbers four and five which have appeared during the year contain material pertaining in the main to Michigan history and early Indiana history. A collection of the civil war letters of Washington Gardner appears in the October, 1917, number of the *Michigan history magazine*. The *Michigan historical collections* will be henceforth exclusively documentary. Selections from the "Journal" of John Sutherland, a prominent Indiana agriculturalist, were contributed by Ella Lonn to the Mississippi Valley Historical Review for December, 1917, pages 362-370.

A valuable reprint of "Ole Rynning's true account of America" may be found in the *Minnesota history bulletin* for November, 1917. This is a careful translation of a rare account of early Norwegian settlement in Illinois. An important contemporary letter pertaining to the Alton riot in which Elijah P. Lovejoy was murdered in 1837, by Winthrop S. Gilman, a member of the firm of Godfrey and Gilman in whose warehouse Lovejoy stored his press, is printed in the Mississippi Valley Historical Review for March, 1918 (pages 491-494). A volume of *Uncollected letters of Abraham Lincoln*[6] by Gilbert A. Tracy (Boston, 1917. 264 p.) contains important material for the Lincoln student and for the historian of Illinois.

The Illinois state historical library, after having suspended its publication activity to coöperate in the centennial celebration has now made rather elaborate plans for the publication of Illinois sources. The celebration of the centennial has called out independent of the editor-in-chief and of the trustees the proposal for three volumes. The first two are to be products of the legislative reference bureau under the supervision of W. F. Dodd. The manuscript of one volume, a reprint of the three constitutions of Illinois with annotations and introduction, should be ready for the press within a few weeks. The second volume will be a reprint of the "Journal of the constitutional convention," 1848, which was printed originally in the *Springfield Register*. The third volume is a reprint of the territorial laws, beginning with those of the Northwest territory. A vol-

[5] To be reviewed later.

[6] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 509-511.

ume of material pertaining to the life of Edward Coles has been suggested. A second volume of George Rogers Clark papers and additional volumes on the British period are in various stages of development.

MEETINGS AND PUBLISHED TRANSACTIONS

The *Annual report* of the American historical association for 1915 (Washington, 1917. 375 p.)[7] includes no papers which touch the field of western history. It does, however, include a report on historical societies in which the agencies to be found in the old northwest are listed. At the 1917 meeting of the association at Philadelphia two papers were read that concerned the history of the upper Mississippi valley: "Influence of wheat and cotton on Anglo-American relations during the civil war," by Louis B. Schmidt, and "To what extent was George Rogers Clark in possession of the northwest at the close of the revolution?" by J. A. James. The latter was read at the joint conference with the Mississippi valley historical association.

The *Proceedings* of the Mississippi valley historical association for 1916-1917 will be issued in an extra number of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review. The following are papers relating to the history of the upper Mississippi valley which will appear: "The coming of the circuit rider across the mountains," by W. W. Sweet; "Pageantry possibilities," by Bernard Sobel; and "Possibilities in state historical celebrations," by Harlow Lindley. The 1918 meeting of the association was held at St. Paul and Minneapolis, May 9-11. Papers on the history of the middle west were read as follows: "The literary spirit among the early Ohio valley settlers," by Logan Esarey; "Religious forces in the United States, 1815-1830," by Martha L. Edwards; "Popular sovereignty and the colonization of Kansas from 1854 to 1860," by W. O. Lynch; "Commercial intercourse with the confederacy in the Mississippi valley, 1861-1865," by E. M. Coulter; "Some relations of the upper Mississippi valley with Lake Superior in the civil war period," by L. B. Shippee; "Indiana state aid for negro deportation," by H. N. Sherwood; "The United States factory system for trading with the Indians," by R. B. Way; "The collapse of the steamboat traffic

[7] To be reviewed later.

upon the Mississippi; an inquiry into causes," by P. W. Brown; "The population of the Ohio valley during the eighteenth century," by J. E. Bradford; and the dedicatory address at the opening of the new building for the Minnesota historical society, "Middle western pioneer democracy," by F. J. Turner.

The Ohio valley historical association held its eleventh annual meeting at Pittsburgh on November 30 and December 1, 1917. The papers read before the association include: "The Ohio valley in the preliminaries of the war of 1812," by C. B. Coleman; "Writers of West Virginia," by Mary Meek; "International relations and the economic development of the Ohio valley a century ago," by Homer C. Hockett; "The work of the Ohio valley historical association in the present crisis," by Elizabeth Crowther; "Early land systems in the Ohio valley," by St. George L. Sioussat; "Western Pennsylvania Indian folk lore," by H. W. Shoemaker; "Washington's Chartiers farm," by Archer B. Hulbert; "The Scioto company and the settlement of Gallipolis," by Harlow Lindley; "The Ohio valley and the Panama congress of 1826," by H. B. Saul; "Early transportation on the Ohio valley rivers," by C. H. Ambler; "The last decade in the Ohio valley," by James R. Robertson; and the presidential address by Burr S. Patterson entitled "The Ohio valley's proper place in history."

The midwinter meeting of the Michigan pioneer and historical society was postponed on account of war conditions; the annual meeting took place at Lansing, May 27-29, 1918. The program was arranged in keeping with the spirit of the times with talks upon the war by ex-Governors Fred Warner, Woodbridge N. Ferris and Chase S. Osborn. An address by the president of the society, Augustus C. Carton, entitled, "What can a historical society do now," called attention to the importance of preserving the records of current Michigan history, especially those of war preparations. Reports of collecting activities were made by representatives of county historical societies. The papers and addresses will appear later in the *Michigan history magazine*.

Several interesting papers presented before the Wisconsin historical society at its sixty-fourth annual meeting are printed

in the *Proceedings*[8] of the society for 1916 (Madison, 1917. 363 p.); these include "President Lincoln as a war statesman," by A. L. Conger; "Reminiscences of a pioneer missionary," by Chrysostom A. Verwyst; "The beginnings of the Norwegian press in America," by Albert O. Barton; "The dream of a northwestern confederacy," by W. C. Cochran; and "The story of Brevet Major Isaac N. Earl," by N. H. Culver. With the establishment of the *Wisconsin magazine of history* it was decided no longer to print papers of an historical character in the *Proceedings*. The *Proceedings* of the sixty-fifth annual meeting of October 25, 1917, therefore, will appear shortly as a sixty or seventy page annual report.

The *Transactions* of the Illinois state historical society for 1916 (Springfield, 1917. 135 p.) prints the following papers: "The first two counties of Illinois and their people," by Fred J. Kern; "The development of the veto power of the governor of Illinois," by N. H. Debel (this is the same article that is published in the *Journal* of the society for October, 1916); "The Indian history of Illinois," by Ralph Linton; "Oddities in early Illinois laws," by J. J. Thompson; "Early Presbyterianism in east central Illinois," by Ira W. Allen; "Sixty years in Chicago," by William J. Onahan; "Slavery or involuntary servitude in Illinois prior to and after its admission as a state," by O. W. Aldrich; and "The Fox river of Illinois," by J. F. Steward.

At the May, 1918, meeting of the Illinois state historical society the following addresses were delivered: "Virginia in the making of Illinois," by J. J. Eckenrode; "The Illinois centennial," by Edmund J. James; "The place of Illinois in the democratic movement of the century," by Allen Johnson; "Establishing the American colonial system in the old northwest," by Elbert J. Benton; "Indiana's interest in historic Illinois," by C. W. Moores; "The Illinois centennial history," by C. W. Alvord; and a "Centennial address," by E. A. Bancroft.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Four new ventures into the fields of periodical publication have been launched within the year. These are all quarterlies:

[8] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 530-531.

the *Michigan history magazine,* official organ of the Michigan historical commission and of the Michigan pioneer and historical society, the first number of which appeared in July, 1917; the *Wisconsin magazine of history,* one of the publications of the state historical society of Wisconsin, which was inaugurated in September, 1917; the *Western Pennsylvania historical magazine,* which made its initial appearance in January, 1918; and the *Illinois Catholic historical review,* publication of which begins in June, 1918. All of these involve a distinct improvement in the publication of historical articles dealing with state history.

After two issues in 1917, the *Michigan history magazine* began its second volume with the issue of January, 1918. Notable articles published in this new quarterly are: "A sketch of the life of Isaac Marston," by W. L. Clements; "The field for the historian in the upper peninsula," by F. X. Barth; "The spirit of the times," by W. N. Ferris; "The first bank in Michigan," by William L. Jenks; "History of St. Mary's parish, Marshall, Michigan," by J. Cahalen; "Will Carleton, Michigan's poet," by B. A. Finney; "Reminiscences of William H. Brockway," by Mrs. Mary Brockway Dickey; "Michigan and the Holland immigration of 1847," by G. Van Schelven; "Holland emigration to Michigan: its causes and results," by G. J. Dikema; "Carl Schurz in Michigan," by E. G. Holden; "History of the equal suffrage movement in Michigan," by K. M. Fox; "Coming of the Italians to Detroit," by J. C. Vismara; "Father Marquette at Michilimackinac," by E. O. Wood; "Congregationalism as a factor in the making of Michigan," by J. P. Sanderson; "Historical sketch of the university of Detroit," by W. T. Doran; "Factional character of early Michigan politics," by F. B. Streeter; "The creation of the territory of Michigan," by W. L. Jenks; "History of prohibition legislation in Michigan," by F. B. Streeter; "James Burrill Angell and the university of Michigan," by W. B. Shaw; "Early Catholic missions in Emmett county," by Thomas Linehan; and "The pageant of Escanaba," by F. E. King.

The first issue of the *Wisconsin magazine of history* appeared in September, 1917. Three numbers present articles as follows: "Increase Allen Lapham, first scholar of Wisconsin," by M. M.

Quaife; "A forest fire in northern Wisconsin," by John L. Bracklin; "Bankers' aid in 1861-62," by Louise P. Kellogg; "The frontier a world problem," by Carl R. Fish; "Early recollections of Lake Geneva," by George Manierre; "Description of a journey to North America, by Ole Knudsen Nattestad," by Rasmus B. Anderson; "A Wisconsin woman's picture of President Lincoln," by Cordelia A. P. Harvey; "The Dutch settlements of Sheboygan county," by Sipko F. Rederus; and "Pioneer recollections of Beloit and southern Wisconsin," by Lucius G. Fisher. The *Wisconsin archeologist* has appeared regularly with such articles as "The Chetek and Rice lakes," by C. E. Brown and R. H. Becker and "Indian remains in Door county," by J. P. Schumaker.

Three issues of the *Journal of the Illinois state historical society*, from October, 1916, to April, 1917, have appeared during the year. They contain such items as: "The development of the veto power of the governor of Illinois," by N. H. Debel; "The founding of Bishop Hill colony," by Eric Johnson; "Penalties of patriotism," a review of the part in Illinois history played by Francis Vigo, Pierre Gibault, George Rogers Clark, and Arthur St. Clair, by J. J. Thompson; "Rev. Colin Dew James, a pioneer Methodist preacher of early Illinois," by Edmund J. James; "Early women preachers in Illinois," by Katherine Stahl; "Times when Lincoln remembered Albion," by Walter Colyer; "Transportation, a factor in the development of northern Illinois previous to 1860," by J. F. Lee; "The Lincoln-Thornton debate of 1856 at Shelbyville," by D. C. Smith and H. H. Cooper; "Abraham Lincoln," by N. G. Flagg; and "The Catholic bishops of the diocese of Alton," by A. Zurbaum. The 1916 number of the *Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanische historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois* reprints the article prepared for *Das Westland* by George Engelmann, entitled "The German settlement five miles east of Belleville," and also "A criticism of Duden's report on the western states of North America," by Gustave Koerner. "Gottfried Duden's report, 1824-1827" is reprinted in translation by William G. Bek, in the *Missouri historical review* for October, 1917, and January, 1918. The first number of the *Illinois Catholic historical review* presents the following papers to its readers: "Early Catholicity in Chi-

cago, 1673-1843," by G. J. Garraghan and "Opportunities for research in Catholic history in the west," by C. W. Alvord.

The *Indiana magazine of history* has had another highly successful year. Some of the most important articles published since June, 1917, are: "Pioneer politics in Indiana," by Logan Esarey; "Colonel John Paul," by Blanche G. Garber; "Universalism in Indiana" (concluded), by Elmo A. Robinson; "The origin and development of the republican party in Indiana," by Charles Zimmerman; "The pioneer aristocracy," by Logan Esarey; "The underground railroad in Monroe county," by H. L. Smith; "Lincoln in Indiana," by J. Edward Murr; and "Topenbee and the decline of the Pottawattamie nation," by Elmore Barce.

The recent issues of the *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly* include "Ohio in the presidential election of 1824," by E. H. Roseboom; "Explorations in the Westenhaver mound," by W. C. Mills; "The mound builder and the Indian according to the book of Mormon," by C. W. Clark; "The Feurt mounds and village site," by William C. Mills; besides articles on "Mac-O-Chee valley," by Keren Jane Gaumer; "Johnson's islands," by Hewson L. Peeke; "Muskingum river pilots," by Irwin Trans; and "Henry Bouquet," by J. C. Reeve. The *Ohio history teachers' journal* for January, 1918, presents an article on "Ohio historiography since the civil war," by Clarence E. Carter.

The *Western Pennsylvania historical magazine,* to be published quarterly by the historical society of western Pennsylvania, made its debut as a pamphlet of fifty-five pages in January, 1918. It avows the purpose of preserving, discussing, and disseminating matters of local history, biography, and belles lettres, and of publishing original letters, records, and journals. The first number includes the "Diary of a young oil speculator;" the "Common place book of Rev. John Taylor," as well as a reprint, from Loudon's *Indian narratives,* of the "Trial of Marmachtago" by Judge Hugh Henry Brackenridge.

The general historical periodicals contain some articles bearing on phases of the history of the old northwest. The September, 1917, issue of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review contains articles entitled "Settlement and development of the

lead and zinc mining region with special emphasis upon Jo Daviess county, Illinois," by B. H. Schockel, and one on "Spanish influence in the west during the American revolution," by J. A. James. The March, 1918, number contains two noteworthy articles: "President Lincoln and the Illinois radical republicans," by Arthur C. Cole, and "The influence of the west on the rise and fall of political parties," by Homer C. Hockett. The *Americana* for January, 1918, appearing in enlarged form as a quarterly instead of monthly, contains an article on "The Northwest territory and the ordinance of 1787," by C. A. Ingraham.

The *Catholic historical review*, July, 1917, has two articles that should appeal to western readers: one by Rev. Charles L. Sonvay, on "Rosati's elevation to the see of St. Louis (1827);" the other by Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, on "Catholic pioneers of the Oregon country." The April, 1918, issue has an article on the "Centenary of Ohio's oldest Catholic church (1818-1918)," by Victor O'Daniel and another on "A centennial of the church in St. Louis (1818-1918)" by Charles L. Sonvay.

Volume five of the second series of the *Papers of the American society of church history* contains a paper entitled "Early theological education west of the Alleghanies," by Jesse Johnson. Among recent magazine articles of special interest to the old northwest is "A century of steam on the great lakes," in *Outlook*, July 11, 1917.

Two articles on "Abraham Lincoln and his work," by Henry A. Stebbins, appear in the April and May, 1917, numbers of *Autumn leaves*. "Lincoln as a neighbor," by P. W. Ayres, appears in the February, 1918 issue of the *Reviews of reviews*. The *Iowa journal of history and politics* for July, 1917, contains an article by Ruth A. Gallaher entitled "The military-Indian frontier, 1830-1835."

MONOGRAPHS AND GENERAL TREATISES

Several general works deserve mention in this connection as having a direct bearing upon the history of the Mississippi valley. *The history of transportation in the United States before 1860*, prepared under the direction of B. H. Meyer by Caroline E. MacGill and a staff of collaborators (Washington, 1917. 676

p.)[9] considers the importance to the west of plank road building, of the introduction of the steamboat on western rivers, and of railroad development. *Wage bargaining on the vessels of the great lakes*, by Henry E. Hoagland (Urbana, 1917. 123 p.)[10] has appeared as the third number of volume 6 of the University of Illinois studies in the social sciences. *The story of corn and the western migration*, by Eugene C. Brooks, (Chicago, 1916. 308 p.)[11] is an attempt to indicate the significance of agriculture in the history of the nation. An *Introductory manual for the study and reading of agrarian history*, by W. J. Trimble, is important for the valuable bibliographical data which is offered to those interested in this comparatively new field of history. *Social history of the American family*, by A. W. Calhoun (Cleveland, 1917, 1918. 348, 390 p.)[12] considers family life in the French west and makes an attempt to appraise the significance of the free lands of the west in their influence upon American family institutions. *Western influence in political parties to 1825: an essay in historical interpretation*,[13] by H. C. Hockett, has appeared as number 4 of the Ohio state university studies in history and political science. *The political history of the public lands from 1840 to 1862*, by G. M. Stephenson (Boston, 1917. 206 p.)[14] throws light on an important phase of American history.

The centennial of the anniversary of the state of Illinois has stimulated considerable activity in the field of historical writing. "Illinois in 1818" by Solon J. Buck (Springfield, 1917. 362 p.) is the forerunner of the five volume centennial history of Illinois. Another volume of University of Illinois studies in the social sciences has been brought out in the past year; it includes *The veto power of the governor of Illinois*, by N. H. Debel (volume VI, numbers 1 and 2, Urbana, 1917. 149 p.).[15] Short histories of Illinois have been issued; *Illinois and the nation*, by O. R. Trowbridge and G. P. Randle (Chicago, 1917.

[9] Reviewed in this number.
[10] Reviewed in this number.
[11] Reviewed in this number.
[12] Reviewed in this number.
[13] To be reviewed later.
[14] To be reviewed later.
[15] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 529-530.

312 p.)[16] and *Illinois, the story of the prairie state*,[17] by Grace Humphrey (Indianapolis, 1917. 267 p. 3 p. bib.). Clarence W. Alvord and Idress Head Alvord are preparing a one volume state history on the basis of the researches of the authors of the centennial history. *Illinois during the fifties*[18] is the title of a quasi-reminiscent study by C. B. Johnson. (Champaign, 1918. 180 p.) *With the national guard on the border*,[19] by Irving G. McCann (St. Louis, 1917. 271 p.), recounts some of the experiences of the first infantry Illinois national guard on the Mexican border in 1916. *Illinois*,[20] by Allan Nevins (New York, 1917. 378 p.), in the American college and university series issued by the Oxford university press, is the first history to be written concerning the University of Illinois. The first volume (Champaign-Urbana, 1918.) of a three volume *Semi-centennial history of the University of Illinois*, by B. E. Powell, has just made its appearance. In the *Quarter-centennial celebration of the university of Chicago* (Chicago, 1918. 234 p.), David A. Robertson records in detail the ceremonies and addresses of June 2-6, 1917. *A history of the Illinois and Michigan canal*[21] by James W. Putnam, has been issued as volume x of the Chicago historical society's collections (Chicago, 1918. 213 p.). Recent developments in Lincolniana require the notice of *Latest light on Abraham Lincoln*,[22] and *War-time memories* by Ervin S. Chapman (New York, Chicago, 1917. 570 p.);[23] *Abraham Lincoln, three addresses*, by M. W. Stryker (Kirkland, N. Y., 1917, 43 p.); *Abraham Lincoln*, an address by C. P. Bissett (Los Angeles, 1916, 561 p.);[24] *Honest Abe, a study in integrity based on the early life of Abraham Lincoln*,[25] by Alonzo Rothschild (Boston, 1917. 374 p.); *Abraham Lincoln*, by W. F. Gordy (New York, 1917. 266 p.); and *Lincoln in Illinois*,[26] by

[16] To be reviewed later.
[17] To be reviewed later.
[18] Reviewed in this number.
[19] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 518-519.
[20] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 398-401.
[21] To be reviewed later.
[22] To be reviewed later.
[23] To be reviewed later.
[24] Reviewed in this number.
[25] To be reviewed later.
[26] To be reviewed later.

Octavia Roberts (Boston, 1918. 119 p.). A volume entitled *The voice of Lincoln*, by R. M. Wanamaker (New York, 1918), has recently been announced. A "new edition with new matter" has appeared of *The life of Abraham Lincoln*, by Ida M. Tarbell (2 vols. New York, 1917. 426, 475 p.). Jesse W. Weik is at work preparing a new edition of *Abraham Lincoln; the true story of a great life*, of which he and William H. Herndon were joint authors. *The history of railroads in Illinois since 1870* is the title announced for the doctoral dissertation (Illinois) of Clare E. Griffin.

The studies series of the publications of the Wisconsin historical society was inaugurated with the painstaking monograph of Frederick Merk entitled *Economic history of Wisconsin during the civil war decade* (Madison, 1916. 414 p.).[27] Mr. Merk has announced the subject of his Harvard doctoral dissertation as *The railroad history of the granger northwest.* Histories of two counties of Wisconsin are being prepared: one of Trempeleau county by E. T. Pierce and one of Door county by Hjalmar R. Holand.

The Michigan historical commission has brought out a careful study of the *Public life of Zachariah Chandler*, by Wilmer C. Harris (Lansing, 1917. 150 p.) as volume two of the university series of its publications. The commission has also issued *Lawton Thomas Hemans: a memorial*, "by the people of Michigan;" a biographical sketch by Mrs. Hemans is followed by numerous tributes garnered from different sources. *Historic Mackinac* (New York, 1918. 697, 773 pp.),[28] dealing with the historical picturesque, and legendary features of Mackinac county, has appeared from the pen of Edwin O. Wood, former president of the Michigan historical commission and vice-president of the Mackinac island park commission. *The life and work of George Sylvester Morris*, by Robert M. Wenley (New York, 1918. 326 p.), is a study of the influence of a prominent university of Michigan professor of the period from 1870 to 1889. *Michigan legislation, 1805-1870* is the announced title of a doctoral dissertation by J. H. Russell (Michigan).

The Indiana centennial still continues to bear fruit in histo-

[27] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 401-402.

[28] To be reviewed later.

rical publications. *Sieur de Vincennes identified*, by Pierre-Georges Roy, and *Morgan's raid in Indiana, by Louis D. Ewbank*, have been issued as numbers of volume VII of the *Indiana historical society publications*. *Historical sketches of the Wabash valley*, by J. W. Whicker (Attica, Ind., 1917. 159 p.); *History of the Church of the Brethren in Indiana*, by Otho Winger (Elgin, 1917. 479 p.); and *Little Turtle, the great chief of the Miami nation*, by C. M. Young (Greenville, Ohio, 1917. 249 p.), are recent volumes in the field of Indiana history. The second and last volume of the *History of Indiana*, prepared by the Indiana historical survey, is in press. The manuscript of a *Political history of Indiana* has been prepared under the same auspices. Jacob P. Dunn has issued a prospectus for an interesting venture in the biographical side of the field of Indiana history.

Ohio publications include *Ohio in four wars, a military history*, by Daniel J. Ryan (Columbus, 1917. 281 p.)[29] and *The first map and description of Ohio 1787*, the map prepared under the direction of Manasseh Cutler together with his *Explanation of the map* (Washington, 1918.). *An old frontier of France*, by Frank H. Severance (2 vols. New York, 1917. 436, 485 p.)[30] is a regional history of the Niagara and of the adjacent lakes during the period of French control. *The history of educational legislation in Ohio*, by Edward Q. Miller, has appeared in the April, 1918, numbers of the *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly* (vol. XXVII, p. 271). *Perry's victory centenary*[31] is the report of the Perry's victory centennial commission of New York, compiled by George D. Emerson (Albany, 1916. 309 p.). George F. Smythe of Gambier, Ohio, has been officially appointed to write a history of the Episcopal church in that state. Doctoral dissertations are in progress on the following topics: *The geography of the Wabash Maumee valley*, by B. H. Schockel (Chicago) and *The religious development of Ohio to 1830*, by Margaret Mitchell (Chicago).

MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS AND ACTIVITIES

The Illinois centennial celebration is proceeding with great

[29] To be reviewed later.

[30] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 519-520.

[31] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 521-622.

success. *The masque of Illinois*, by Wallace Rice (Springfield, 1918. 30 p.), has been written for community production during the year and has been received with enthusiasm; the masque very effectively introduces Mr. Rice's "Hail, Illinois," a vigorous and effective state song. *The wonderful story of Illinois*, by Grace A. Owen (Springfield, 1918. 48 p.), is another pageant published and distributed by the centennial commission. The commission has published a *Centennial bulletin*, since October 1, 1917, in which the director of the celebration has offered a comprehensive discussion of plans and programs for county and local celebrations.

The university of Illinois expected to combine the centennial celebration of the state with the semi-centennial of the university, for which William Chauncey Langdon was engaged as pageant-master. While the formal celebration has been abandoned several historical masques and pageants have been staged. The April meeting of the Illinois state historical society was the formal celebration under state auspices. The Chicago historical society simultaneously held a commemorative meeting which was featured by an address on "Illinois in history" by the Rev. Charles P. Anderson. Special patriotic music by a large chorus was arranged for the occasion and a display of old historic flags that had waved over Illinois from the discovery of the Mississippi river by De Soto to the centennial year. At the same time an exhibit was displayed of objects illustrating Illinois history selected from collections of the Chicago historical society; this exhibit will be on view throughout the year at the society's building. Its museum has been reorganized to secure better coördination and to coöperate with the Council of national defense and the committee on public information in the process of inculcating patriotism by means of history.

The *Annual checklist of periodicals and newspapers currently received at the Wisconsin historical library*, corrected to January 1, 1918, will appear shortly. A supplement to the society's catalog of newspaper files, issued in 1911, has been prepared and is now in press. *Collect material for Wisconsin's war history now* and *Directions for organizing war history committees and*

collecting war material are the titles of bulletins one and two issued by the Wisconsin war history commission.

The *Year-book of the Sandusky county pioneer and historical association* (Fremont, Ohio, 1917. 77 p.) suggests the activities of the most aggressive county historical agency in Ohio. The pamphlet is in large part made up of the reminiscences of pioneers.

The Michigan historical commission has actively assisted the Michigan pioneer and historical society, the county auxiliary societies, and the women's clubs and patriotic societies working in Michigan history. County historical societies were organized in 1917 in Marquette and Alger counties, and other societies have been kept active by the visits of agents of the commission. The commission is attempting to arouse greater interest in the teaching of Michigan history and is preparing two volumes of "readings in Michigan history" to supplement the regular textbooks. The secretary of the commission has also prepared an outline of twenty-five topics for the use of teachers which is printed in the April, 1918, issue of the *Michigan history magazine*; the commission supplies sets of the *Michigan pioneer and historical collections* to all school libraries which request them. William E. Brown of Dexter, a former Indian missionary, is preparing a volume of *Indian legendary poems and songs of cheer with assistance from the commission.* The prize essays written by pupils of Michigan schools in 1916-1917 on the subject "The first school and the children who attended it" have been published by the commission as Bulletin number 9.

Arthur C. Cole

University of Illinois
Urbana

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

A Reconsideration of Gold Discoveries in the Northwest

In a recent number of the Mississippi Valley Historical Review[1] Messrs. P. C. Phillips and H. A. Trexler present a judicious critique of assertions made with regard to the part taken by Father De Smet in the discovery of gold in the northwest. They discuss also the claims of others to priority in discovery, and particularly those made on behalf of François (or "Benetsee") Finlay; concerning all these latter claims, the authors in summary say, "Legitimate evidence of their veracity is lacking, and we can consign them all to tradition."[2] They then set forth their own views as to the real discoverers and the significance of the achievements of the latter in a paragraph which is quoted in full as follows:[3]

"The Stuart brothers and Reese Anderson present the *first valid claim to the discovery of gold in the northwest, and there is no doubt that they are responsible for the gold rush to the territory now comprising Montana and Idaho.* The Stuart party was returning from an unsuccessful expedition to California, when they decided to try their luck once more in the mountains north of the Great Salt lake. In 1857 they crossed the Red Rock divide into the old Idaho territory. The following year they found gold in paying quantities on Gold or Benet-

[1] Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 4: 89-97.

[2] *Ibid.*, 4: 97. In regard to the "Benetsee" claim the authors say there is no contemporary account, nor "have we a word written subsequently by anyone who saw Benetsee with the gold." *Ibid.*, 4: 93. Question may be raised, however, as to whether this sweeping statement can apply strictly to a confirmatory assertion of Angus MacDonald, who says in his "Few items of the west," "The first authentic gold dug in Montana was brought me from Flint Creek and assayed by a friend of mine and made known by me to Major Owens and a few other friends in 1850." The recollections of MacDonald in manuscript under the above caption are in the Montana historical and miscellaneous library, and have lately been published in the *Washington historical quarterly*, 8: 201. My attention was called to these "Items" by Mr. William S. Lewis of Spokane.

[3] Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 4: 97. The italics are mine.

see creek, between the present cities of Deer Lodge and Missoula, Montana. *It was news of this discovery that started the gold rush to the northwest and paved the way for its future development.*"

The present author is not particularly concerned with questions of mere priority, although the assertion on this point above seems to him questionable, if not erroneous. Neither is he in the least disposed to detract from the fame of such rightly honored pioneers as James and Granville Stuart.[4] Their reputation, indeed, in the history of the northwest mining regions is securely based on real achievements and on the interweaving of their lives into the community development, and can not be enhanced by historical inflation. What the present paper will attempt to show is that the discoveries at Gold creek in fact had no such widespreading results as are asserted in the paragraph quoted, but that the succession of remarkable discoveries which opened up the northwest mining regions came, not as the issue of the operations of any individuals, but as an extensive and important movement. Not, primarily, controversial criticism, but the setting forth of the historical perspective of this movement, is the purpose therefore of the following remarks.

Let us inquire, first, precisely what the Stuart brothers did. At the expiration of five years spent in California in mining, herding stock, and the like, they decided on a visit to the "states" in 1857, but on the way thither were held up by the Mormon disturbance. They fell in with mountaineers who were trading along the emigrant trail and determined to go with them to their wintering quarters in the Beaver Head valley. Here the Stuarts heard the rumors of previous prospecting at Benetsee or Gold creek and proceeded thither in the spring of 1858. There was no evidence in the vicinity of mining operations having been previously carried on. They found fair prospects, especially after having dug a prospecting hole about five feet deep. In

[4] Anderson was not conspicuous after the first venture. An attempt at an impartial appraisal of the character of the pioneers of the mining period is made in William Trimble, *The mining advance into the inland empire: a comparative study of the beginning of the mining industry in Idaho and Montana, eastern Washington and Oregon, and the southern interior of British Columbia; and of institutions and laws based upon that industry* (University of Wisconsin bulletin, no. 683 — Madison, 1914), 151-160.

June of 1858 they went to Fort Bridger and stayed in the vicinity of Green river until the fall of 1860, when they returned to Gold creek. Here they found that one Henry Thomas had during the summer of 1860 been carrying on mining operations with crude implements; the effort was continued the next summer. James Stuart went to Fort Benton for supplies in the spring of 1861, but failed to get them because of the burning of an expected steamer. Then an order for picks and shovels was sent via pack-train to Walla Walla, which had now become, because of the flourishing mines on the Clearwater, a recognized center for miners' supplies.

Equipped with tools from Walla Walla, the Stuarts in the spring of 1862 began operations and on May 8 they "set the first string of sluices ever used in Montana." Meantime, in the fall of 1861, they had written to their brother Thomas in Colorado territory their opinion that this was a promising gold country. He showed the letters to "many friends," with the result that in the spring of 1862 "quite a number" left for Deer Lodge. Twelve of these arrived in June, and later other parties came, most of them en route for the Salmon river mines.

But the Gold creek operations were carried on for the most part "with indifferent success," yields were light, and there was certainly no large and well-advertised rush thither. The discovery of the really rich placers on Grasshopper creek attracted attention and population, and Bannack became the first mining camp of any magnitude in Montana. James Stuart went there and was conspicuous in a prospecting expedition, a straying portion of which discovered the great placers of Alder Gulch in 1863. He died in 1873. Granville Stuart has continued an honored citizen of Montana, noted for his writings on pioneer days.[5]

Let us revert now to the assertion that the Stuart brothers (and Anderson) "present the first valid claim to the discovery of gold in the northwest." It may be conceded at once that these gentlemen may be said to have been the first to authenticate by sluice process the existence of gold within the territory

[5] The above account has been summarized from Granville Stuart, "Life of James Stuart," in *Contributions to the historical society of Montana* (Helena, 1876-), 1: 36-61, and the same author's "Historical sketch of Deer Lodge county," *ibid.*, 2: 119-125. Confirmation of the poor yields at Gold creek is found in reports in *Collections of the North Dakota historical society* (Bismarck, 1906-), 2: 65, 74.

now occupied by the state of Montana, though this affirmation does not involve causal connection historically with the three large "rushes" by which Montana was brought into being, those namely to Bannack, Alder Gulch, and Last Chance. The further content of the claim to priority will depend to a considerable extent upon what is meant by "the northwest."

The authors at least include Idaho in "the northwest"; but in order to get before the mind the country as a whole one must conceive of it as it appeared to the miners, practically at first without political boundaries. The whole group of mining localities which began to develop in the decade from 1855-1865 in the region now comprised in eastern Washington and Oregon, southern British Columbia, Idaho (north and south) and western Montana, was established, indeed, in a section possessing considerable physiographic and historical unity; but to find for the whole a precise designation is difficult. Except for the mines on the headwaters of the Missouri (which have close historical connection), it is comprehended within the upper basin of the Columbia, inclusive of the Snake. Terms frequently used in California were "the northern mines" or "the northern interior."[6] Within the region, "inland empire" has gained currency to express sectional consciousness.[7] Perhaps a general designation as the northwest mining region will serve the present purpose, if we keep in mind that the historical movement included in general the political provinces mentioned above.[8] Into this region, at any rate, there came, beginning in 1855, a series of interrelated mining rushes which ushered in a new stage of industry, society, and government and led to the establishment of the territories of Idaho and Montana and the colony of British Columbia.

The first movement of importance in this series was directed to the vicinity of old Fort Colville, on the Columbia river. Gold was discovered by Joseph Morel, a teamster in the employ of

[6] See the *San Francisco Daily Bulletin* in many issues between 1858 and 1865.

[7] This term has been utilized in the author's *Mining advance into the inland empire.* There is a discussion of the unity of the movement in *ibid.*, 143-148.

[8] A contemporary observer of the movement styled it a "tide of picks and pans." *San Francisco Daily Bulletin,* August 5, 1862. A study of special value, both for interpretation and information, is Leslie M. Scott, "The pioneer stimulus of gold in the northwest," in *Oregon historical quarterly,* 18: 147-166.

Angus MacDonald, in the fall of 1854.[9] The next year many inhabitants of the Puget sound region and of the Willamette valley prospected and mined in this locality. Gold was found over a wide area, and miners made from three to twelve dollars per day. But deposits were superficial and development was hindered for a time by the outbreak of the Indian war of 1856-1858, which was precipitated largely by the coming of the miners.[10] Yet a sufficient number were at Colville in 1857 to permit the calling of a miners' meeting and the formation of an elementary government.[11] Many of the miners turned northward at the suggestion of MacDonald, and there soon followed the great rush to Fraser river in 1858 and later the more permanent developments in Cariboo. There was a considerable movement also in 1859-1860 to the Similkameen river, close to the boundary. The colony of British Columbia was founded as a result of these events.[12]

Meanwhile, in the summer of 1860, a party under the leadership of E. D. Pierce, who had been at Similkameen, discovered rich prospects on a tributary of Oro Fino creek in the Nez Percés country within territory now in Idaho.[13] About sixty men spent the winter in these mines. The next year there ensued a rush which was participated in by several thousand men,

[9] MacDonald, "A few items from the west," in *Washington historical quarterly*, 8: 201. MacDonald's active interest in furnishing information of discoveries is revealed in Kinahan Cornwallis, *The new El Dorado; or, British Columbia* (London, 1858), 341, and William C. Hazlitt, *British Columbia, and Vancouver Island, comprising a historical sketch of the British settlements in the northwest coast of America; and a survey of the physical character . . . of that region* (London, 1858), 128. The significance of "Benetsee" Finlay's work appears to lie in his connection with MacDonald rather than in any direct effect upon Montana history.

[10] *Executive documents*, 34 congress, 3 session, 9: no. 76, p. 158; *Olympia Pioneer and Democrat*, September 9, 14, 28, October 19, November 23, 1855; Ethelbert O. S. Scholefield and Frederick W. Howay, *British Columbia from the earliest times to the present* (Chicago, 1914), 2: 9-11. These activities occurred, it will be observed, three years before the advent of the Stuart party on the Columbia side of the watershed at Gold creek.

[11] Portland *Oregonian*, January 30, 1858.

[12] Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of British Columbia* (*Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft*, vol. 32 — San Francisco, 1887), 341-542; Trimble, *Mining advance into the inland empire*, 24-61.

[13] Ritz, "Settlement of the great northern interior," manuscript; Bancroft, *History of Washington, Idaho, and Montana, 1845-1889* (*Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft*, vol. 31 — San Francisco, 1890), 234.

a large proportion of whom obtained claims which paid well. Transportation routes were opened up, new towns were started, and prospecting was widely carried on. By far the most important of the districts discovered in the latter process was that which became widely known as the Salmon river mines, which was discovered in July, 1861.[14] The deposits were superficially very rich, and startling yields were reported. The new country was hailed as the Dorado of the northern mines, and the roseate predictions of its superlative richness which were spread by newspapers during the winter of 1861-1862 resulted the next spring in large migrations thither both from the coast and from various parts of the east.[15] These migrations from the east contributed directly to the opening of the first large placer mines in the territory later known as Montana.

It is difficult to see how it can be affirmed that the achievements of the Stuarts had any causal connection with these big movements into northern Idaho. Their work in 1858 was simply prospecting such as was being done in other localities within the mining region;[16] there is no evidence to show that it contributed to the discoveries on the Clearwater and the Salmon; and these immensely more extensive developments antedated the mining operations of the Stuarts at Gold creek in 1862. The case is even more obvious with regard to southern Idaho (Boise basin, etc.), initial discoveries in which were historically connected with these developments at Salmon river and with those of eastern Oregon.[17] It seems certain, therefore, that the Stuart brothers were not in the least responsible for the gold rush to the territory later comprising Idaho.

Let us now turn to trace the evolution of the mining camps of that portion of the mining territory which later was included in Montana. As has been alluded to above, the alluring and wide-

[14] *Ibid.*, 233-249; William A. Goulder, *Reminiscences; incidents in the life of a pioneer in Oregon and Idaho* (Boise, Idaho, 1909), 178-242; Trimble, *Mining advance into the inland empire*, 62-72.

[15] *San Francisco Daily Bulletin*, October 24, 1861, February 28, March 23, June 3, 1862; *Overland Press*, April 21, 1862. See also Scott, "Pioneer stimulus of gold," in *Oregon historical quarterly*, 18: no. 3, p. 5, n. 22.

[16] *Ibid.*, also Goulder, *Reminiscences*, 200.

[17] Bancroft, *History of Washington, Idaho and Montana*, 259-263; John Hailey, *History of Idaho* (Boise, Idaho, 1910), 32-44 (especially Splawn's account); William J. McConnell, *Early history of Idaho* (Caldwell, Idaho, 1913), 79-99.

ly advertised prospects of the Salmon river mines drew in their direction large numbers of people in the spring of 1862.[18] Not only did these people come from the Pacific coast by way of the Columbia, but large parties converged towards Salmon river over the plains from Minnesota, up the Missouri by steamboat, and over the old Oregon trail.[19] One incentive to taking the first two routes was the Mullan military road which had recently been constructed between Fort Benton and Walla Walla. All these immigrants of course prospected when they got into the mining regions and about the middle of the summer, almost simultaneously, parties arriving on the headwaters of the Missouri, discovered "prospects" at a number of points. The most important discovery was made at Grasshopper creek by some immigrants of whom John White seems to have been in some sort the leader. This group, like many others, was trying to penetrate to the Salmon river mines by way of old Fort Lemhi.[20] The physiography of the country between the vicinity of Fort Lemhi and the Salmon river mines, however, is of the most forbidding character, while that northward toward Deer Lodge is comparatively inviting.[21] It may well have been that reports from Gold creek helped to draw wanderers northward, but there was also the desire to get to the Mullan road. At any rate, there began on Grasshopper creek "the first important mining operations in this Territory."[22] To this locality, where

[18] The Salmon river mines of course were merely the most prominent. The Powder river and John Day mines in northeastern Oregon were also important foci at this time. For reference see Scott, "Pioneer stimulus of gold," in *Oregon historical quarterly*, 18: no. 3, p. 5, n. 24.

[19] *Collections of the North Dakota historical society*, 2: part 2, p. 34-78; Captain John Mullan, "Report on the construction of a military road from Fort Walla-Walla to Fort Benton," *Senate executive documents*, 37 congress, 3 session, no. 43, 34-35; Bancroft, *History of Washington, Idaho and Montana*, 617-624, especially notes 38 (p. 617) and 5 (p. 622); *Contributions to the historical society of Montana*, 2: 122.

[20] There were about a hundred men in one party which came via the Oregon trail. See account in the *Country Gentleman*, 21: 35.

[21] "In crossing the Rocky Mountains we had plenty of grass, wood and water, and the most beautiful mountain country I ever saw — it is more like rolling prairie land covered with grass, with scattered patches of timber, and but little bed rock in sight." Letter concerning a trip from Boise to Deer Lodge, *Owyhee Avalanche*, January 6, 1866.

[22] Address by W. A. Clark, in *Contributions to the historical society of Montana*, 2: 48.

East Bannack sprang up, came the foundational "rush" to Montana.

Whatever the degree of significance in Montana history which is to be assigned to the honored pioneers of Gold creek, the assertion of Messrs. Phillips and Trexler that "it was news of this discovery that started the gold rush to the northwest and paved the way for its future development" must be looked upon as the substitution of the accessory for the fundamental, as the attribution to individuals of that which in reality was due to a process of historical evolution.

William Trimble

North Dakota Agricultural College
Fargo

A journal from our legation in Belgium. By Hugh Gibson, secretary of the American legation, Brussels. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page and company, 1917. 362 p. $2.50)

This is one of the most interesting of the flood of books which the war has yet produced. The author was secretary of the American legation in Belgium during the first three years of the war and his opportunity for observing the conduct of the Germans was such as came to few other foreigners in the country. He may therefore be described as an official witness of the rape of Belgium. His book is not a systematic treatise but rather a diary written at odd moments from day to day as the events which he describes took place. His story, therefore, consists of the impressions and observations of a man, who at the time was a neutral, who sought to describe what he saw without bias or prejudice. As such his testimony is entitled to high weight in the "supreme court of civilization" before which the Germans will be tried. After the outbreak of the war the American legation took over the affairs of Great Britain and Germany in Belgium and Mr. Gibson came in contact almost daily with the German authorities. From time to time he visited various parts of the country, conversed with the Germans and Belgians, heard the stories of both sides and saw with his own eyes burned and ruined towns, wrecked cathedrals, devastated districts, and other evidences of German ruthlessness. He was at Antwerp at the time of the aerial raid in September, 1914, and saw the ruined buildings and the dead and maimed bodies which were left in its wake. He visited Louvain shortly after its partial destruction and recorded in his diary that his conversations with the people who were there when the trouble began "only served to strengthen the impression that the whole affair was part of a cold-blooded and calculated plan to terrorize the civilian population." He talked with inhabitants of Tamines and was told that over 600 people were shot there. He tells of his fruitless efforts to save the life of Miss Cavell, how she was brutally hurried to her death, how she was denied the benefit of counsel until she was formally arraigned at the bar and how the German military authorities in spite of their repeated promises to the American legation systematically concealed from the American minister all information in regard to the trial, conviction, and execution. All these and other atrocities committed by the Germans—how they

murdered innocent civilians, burned and pillaged Belgian towns, exploited the country by means of requisitions, fines, and contributions, terrorized the population and rode rough-shod over the established laws of war are told in a plain straightforward manner, without a trace of bias or prejudice. Mr. Gibson readily admits, as many fair-minded Belgians themselves admit, that there were occasional instances of "sniping" by the inhabitants; but they were only isolated cases and constituted no justification for the terrible retribution that was again and again meted out to the communities in which such acts were committed. The whole story constitutes a vivid and damning indictment against German policy in Belgium, the truth of which none but a very incredulous person will ever deny.

JAMES W. GARNER

Diary of a nation. The war and how we got into it. By Edward S. Martin of "Life." (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page and company, 1917. 407 p. $1.50 net)

Editorial utterances are, as a rule, not worthy of republication. They are often the product of a momentary mood; they are frequently based on slight information; and their interest usually disappears when the problem under discussion enters upon a new phase. And yet, in defiance of this fact, Mr. Edward S. Martin has ventured to publish an entire volume of editorials ranging over a period of nearly three years; and the reviewer believes that they will be read with as much pleasure now as on the day when they first appeared.

It is not possible to review a volume of this sort; all that can be done, and all that need be done, is to call attention to its existence. Nor does it seem necessary to catalog its many qualities, least of all to mention the author's kindly humor and biting wit, for the humor of *Life* is far more widely known and appreciated than many good people are willing to admit. It surely is a pleasure to have the opportunity to read in consecutive order all the delightful things that Mr. Martin has found to say during the past three years about the kaiser, Mr. Roosevelt, Josephus Daniels, Mr. Bryan, the pro-Germans, the pacifists, and all the other prominent actors in the farces and tragedies of contemporary life. The reader will also be impressed with the faithful manner in which these editorials reflect the changing moods and varying emotions of the American people during the fateful months when German aggression was forcing us into war; and the volume is therefore not improperly named *The diary of a nation.*

L. M. L.

Early diplomatic relations between the United States and Japan, 1853-1865. By Payson Jackson Treat, Ph.D., professor of far eastern history, Stanford university. [Albert Shaw lectures on diplomatic history, 1917] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins press, 1917. 458 p. $2.50)

This is an independent study, and forms a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the opening of Japan to the world. The most important new material is from the private correspondence of Robert H. Pruyn, minister-resident of the United States in Japan, from 1862 to 1865. Wide use has been made also of the writings of Japanese on their own history. It is not probable that much could be added from American or Japanese sources, though one would like to know if the archives of the state department were examined. The British parliamentary papers, also, have been exhausted, but one feels that the record office and the British press might add something. The French, Russian, and Dutch material, too, must some day be unearthed. Yet, while these additional stores may add relevant details, they are not likely materially to change the narrative here given.

The chief contribution lies in the clean drawing of the course of foreign negotiations against a background equally clean, though less ample, of Japanese politics. Many new facts are used, and sound and industrious scholarship revealed, but these are subordinate to a skillful synthesis that carries conviction of reliability. Mr. Treat is decidedly favorable to the Japanese, with a distinct leaning toward the Shogunate. He is convinced of the skill and correct policy of our representatives, Harris and Pruyn, in their disagreements with their European colleagues. Yet his presentation is so fair that it would be quite possible to base on his account an argument in favor of the policy of the British representative Alcock.

The intrinsic importance of the subject is sufficient justification of the book. In connection with American foreign policy, its chief interest lies in the honorable and friendly spirit displayed, and in the initiation strongly at variance with our policy in other parts of the world, proved to be permanent with regard to that continent. While Harris urges patience with the Japanese as a "semi-civilized" nation, one cannot but be impressed with their intellectual preparedness for a place in the world. If the memorial of the Shogun to the mikado in 1858, proposing that Japan become a member of an alliance for punishing a nation which might act against international interests, and for protecting "harmless but powerless nations," and that it was the "great destiny" of Japan to have its emperor become the "Great ruler of all nations," illustrates oriental imagination, it was founded on arguments, if drawn from Harris at least thoroughly assimilated, which are still sound. Not

least interesting is the appreciation displayed by Japanese opposing as well as favoring foreign intercourse, that much must be learned from the outside world. Often times those preparing to resist and those favoring the foreigner were actually working along the same line.

The book covers a real period. At its beginning Japan had no relations with the outside world except the slight tie with Dutch and Chinese at Nagasaki. This is the period of struggle. At its close, Japan was definitely opened. It is intended as the first part of an extensive study of all Japanese-American diplomatic relations. It is admirably footnoted, and contains bibliography and index.

CARL RUSSELL FISH

The mikado institution and person. A study of the internal political forces of Japan. By William Elliot Griffis, D.D., L.H.D., formerly of the Imperial university of Tokyo. (Princeton: Princeton university press, London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford university press, 1915. 346 p. $1.50 net)

The mikado as "institution" is mikadoism, which, as stated in the preface, "is the symbol of all that is dear to the Japanese; yet, like all social forces, whether religion, or the magic of a great name, or the national flag, the dogma is often abused by its so-called friends, is made an unnecessary engine of cruelty, or is debased to selfish or mercenary purposes." Again, (p. 15) "the Mikado is the living symbol of all that is glorious in the history of Everlasting Great Japan. He expresses to the sons of Nippon whatever is dearest in the present and auspicious in the future. He incarnates history and religion. His person embodies the nation's memory and the people's hope." Mikadoism is thus a cult which embodies the traditions concerning the mikado (emperor?) as religious and political head of his people.

This cult, as explained in chapter 5, originated "before there was a Government," in a clan ritual that "always had been." Nameless at first, it was later designated as the "Way of the Gods" (ancestors), Shinto. "Codeless, ethicless and without dogma," it was "simply propriety, loyalty, the attitude of mind becoming the ruled in presence of their rulers," showing also "how man felt in the presence of the spirits of the dead and the powers mysterious." "Mikadoism generated the military, political and unifying ideas and forces which have made the Japanese a nation." Stimulated and supplemented by Buddhism, mikadoism was developed by politicians—from motives of "officeholder's greed of power and pelf" or of "conservative precaution." While the mikado was exalted to the "shelf of the blue clouds," he was shorn of direct political power and kept in seclusion. "Under the shadow of such

a dual system, the power and life of Mikadoism sank to a mythology." "For nearly six centuries the institution remained a ghostly shadow."

The revival of this cult became a prime factor in the restoration of the mikado to political power. It unified the nation in loyalty to the mikado, now designated Tenshi, son of heaven or emperor. It is the secret of Japanese imperial power, and its influence was greatly increased by the wise exercise of that power by the new emperor. The major part of the book is a narrative of the events through which mikadoism influenced the restoration and the successful reign of the Meiji emperor. Of thirty-three chapters, five deal specifically with this emperor and his family. He mainly represents the mikado as "person," since little personal information concerning his predecessors is given.

The book contains little new material. The imperial traditions, Shinto, their influence on the restoration, the history of events connected with the restoration and with the Meiji era have severally been more authoritatively explained. The merit of this work lies in bringing them all together in form conveniently accessible for the general reader. Its chief novelty is a certain amount of intimate detail concerning the personality and the private life of Emperor Mutsuhito. On the vital question of this emperor's share in actual government there is little new or definite information. The reviewer once put this question to the late Captain Brinkley—probably the best informed foreigner, except Mr. Denison, concerning Japanese political affairs. The reply was that any wish or decision of the emperor was executed without question. How often the emperor, as against his counselors, expressed wishes and decisions is another question. It remains so, after careful reading of this book. The viewpoint occasionally approximates adulation: "superb" national constitution (p. 6); "Man of Peace, Mutsuhito, Emperor of Divine, Unconquerable, Everlasting, Great Japan" (p. 149); "unconsciously borrowed ideas shamed the originals" (p. 176). Yet certain Japanese pretensions are rigorously characterized (pp. 16, 23, 54, 207).

The value of the book is impaired by absence of references (there are only six), by occasional inconsistency, and by inaccuracy or vagueness of statement that may mislead. Space permits but few illustrations. The constitution is declared "higher even than the Emperor's will" (p. 12), yet promulgated "to exhibit the principles by which We are to be guided" (p. 22). The Richardson incident is, contrary to generally accepted views, represented as if sought by Shimadzu, "resolved on bringing the Shogun into trouble with the foreigners" (p. 106). Misleading are statements that "Japan was without the rights of national sovereignty," and had "granted with easy and frivolous acquiescence" the treaty of 1858 (p. 206); that the Japan-China war occurred in 1904

(pp. 165, 233); that "in 1900, led by Great Britain, the Western Powers made treaties with constitutional Japan on the status of an equal" (p. 330). The last statement presumably refers to the series of treaties made 1894-1897 (that with Great Britain July 16, 1894) and effective July, 1899. An obviously typographical error is the year Mutsuhito became emperor, printed 1866 instead of 1867 (p. 122).

There is some confusion of arrangement, with frequent digression, notably in chapters 10, 20, 33, while the greater part of material in chapters 23 and 25 has little relevancy to the captions. The style is rather florid, at times cumbrous and confused (pp. 130, 143, 220, 310, 332). An impression of vagueness also results from repeated use of allusions where definite statements are expected. The humor attempted in connection with the use of the terms "greatly exaggerated" (p. 84), "two days (years?) old" (p. 122), "noddles" and "killing tools" (p. 239) is of a quality more likely to shock than to please the reader. Despite defects, the book is interesting and suggestive. There is an index.

E. H. Vickers

Quest of El Dorado. The most romantic episode in the history of South American conquest. By Reverend J. A. Zahm, C.S.C., Ph. D. (H. J. Mozans) (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1917. 261 p. $1.50 net)

This volume consists of a compilation of articles formerly published by the author in the *Pan American bulletin*, dealing mainly with the expeditions of the Spaniards, Germans (Welsers), and English (Sir Walter Raleigh) in search of the mythical kingdom of the "Gilded King." The author is profoundly moved by the romantic spirit of the age of the *conquistadores*; he "feels the spell of romance and can easily dream of the gorgeous capitals, whose glamour in days gone by proved such an attraction to the thousands of the most gallant and noble spirits of the Spanish conquest." That is the spirit of this book, which will appeal to "those who love the curious and romantic phases of history."

In a preliminary chapter on sources, the author places his chief reliance on three important, though little-known (to us of North America) contemporary ecclesiastical authorities. These are Fray Pedro Simon's *Noticias historiales*, Castellanos' *Historia del Nuevo Reino de Granada* and Carvajal's *Descuorimiento del Rio de Amazonas.* The value of the *Quest of El Dorado* as a piece of historical writing would have been enhanced considerably had the author remained nearer to his sources, and had he quoted from them more extensively in passages dealing with the actual motives of the leaders of the expeditions in question. In fact the essen-

tial point, namely that the object of these expeditions was the quest of El Dorado, is not in all cases definitely proved.

The second chapter is devoted to a presentation of the El Dorado myth and to a bare mention of the Belalcazar expedition from Quito in 1535, while the following two chapters deal with the discovery of the Amazon by Gonzalo Pizarro and Francisco de Orellana in 1541, and the expeditions of Von Hutten in 1541 and of Quesada in 1545 from Coro and Bogotá respectively. Notable among the other enterprises briefly described or referred to in the following chapters were those of Gonzalo Ximenes de Quesada in 1579 and of Berrío in 1584. Both these expeditions were equipped in Santa Fé de Bogotá and they resulted in the exploration of the Orinoco. The best chapter in the book is that which sets forth the ideas of Sir Walter Raleigh and describes his efforts to find the mythical kingdom.

Attractive as the book is from a literary point of view, as a piece of historical writing it suffers from undue emphasis on this one (the gilded) side of the romance of the *conquistadores*. Did one not know that Spanish exploration and occupation of Latin America were prompted by other motives as well, one would be misled by the book. With this viewpoint, there is consequently lacking any but the most bare reference to the fact that "The region bounded by the Orinoco and the Amazon, the Andes, and the Rio Negro, has never since the conquest been so carefully explored as it was by the men who went in search of the Gilded King and the golden capital of the Omaguas. . .They opened up to the colonist and the missionary the broad savannas and woodlands of the east of the great Andean chain and were thus indirectly instrumental in establishing missions which, for generations, exerted so beneficent an influence in civilizing and Christianizing the aborigines that they commanded the attention of the world." To what extent these considerations constituted motives for any of this exploration is not shown.

Typographically, the book is a work of art. It is printed on a quality of paper which is rarely used these days, and this has made it possible to reproduce with success some rare and interesting cuts and maps, gleaned from sources not generally available. It is noted that on page 211 the very legible signature and rubrica of Hernando Pizarro is labelled as that of Fray Gaspar Carvajal. The signature of this friar is correctly reproduced on page 229. The book is equipped with a complete index and a bibliography. It is entertainingly written and should be of interest to all who are attracted by the phase of history with which it deals and the viewpoint which it represents, and to those generally who admire well-written and carefully-edited books. It will also be of service in inviting the attention of North American readers and students to a phase of the heroic age of Latin-American history wherein the suffering

and sacrifices of the *conquistadores* far outweighed the material recompense attained.

CHARLES H. CUNNINGHAM

American plan of government. The constitution of the United States as interpreted by accepted authorities. By Charles W. Bacon, A.B., assisted by Franklyn S. Morse, A.B., A.M., with an introduction by George Gordon Battle, M.A. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1916, 474 p. $2.50 net)

In a brief introduction we are told that the purpose of this volume is to explain "what the plan of our government actually is" and to show "how this plan has been found sufficient for the management of the business of a nation which uses commercial and industrial machinery not dreamed of in the constitution-making era." (p. xiii) Treating as he does such a broad field within the limited space of 465 pages, the author makes no pretense to exhaustive treatment or profound scholarship. The merit of the book is said to lie, not in the fact that it contributes new material, but in the original method of arranging and presenting old material.

The "actual plan" is set forth by describing the origin and meaning of the provisions of the constitution of 1787 while the sufficiency of the plan for modern needs is indicated by noting the construction placed upon these provisions from time to time by the courts. After two introductory chapters on constitutional development prior to 1789 the written document is treated phrase by phrase and the meaning of each is sought in the circumstances surrounding its origin and its subsequent interpretation. Comments by the author are supplemented by those of recognized commentators but most reliance is placed on important judicial decisions that have thrown light upon hidden meanings of vague constitutional provisions.

The book is thus not in any sense an adequate description of our government as it is today; nor is it a description of the evolution of our constitutional system except insofar as such has been the result of judicial interpretation. There is not even a suggestion that the people play any part in the selection of the president, or that such institutions as political parties exist. Practices with reference to federal appointments, the cabinet, executive control of legislation, and so on, all of which have materially modified some of the original plans, are left unnoticed for the obvious reason that they have developed extra-constitutionally. The distinction between actual government and the actual plan of government must, therefore, be kept constantly in mind by the reader.

The necessity for brevity has compelled the author to exercise wide discretion in the allotment of space and doubtless no two persons would

agree as to what should be included and what excluded. At times, however, it would seem that the treatment given some subjects is out of proportion to their importance. The significance of the due process and commerce clauses as means of constitutional expansion and adaptation would seem to justify more extensive treatment than is found in the thirty pages devoted to these topics. Due process itself is disposed of in nine pages which is practically the same amount of space accorded such subjects as self-incrimination (7 pages), trade marks and copyrights (6 pages), qualifications of representatives (7½ pages), treason (6 pages), and the full faith and credit clause (7 pages). Again, the importance of the constitutional problems involved in the government of the insular possessions is not very clearly indicated by a mere reference to and quotation from the case of Downes *v.* Bidwell (page 437). Other instances could be cited. The general result is that the reader is often left with a very inadequate conception of the real significance some of these sections of the constitution have assumed in modern times.

A brief analysis of the treatment of the due process clauses will suffice as an example of what is meant. The term is defined by quoting Justice's explanation of its meaning in the case of Hurtado *v.* California. The courts have, of course, consistently refused to define the term and few would contend that the statement of the justice would serve as a definition. In all, six of the nine pages on the subject relate to due process as it affects criminal procedure, while in the remaining three pages its possibilities as a restraint on state action under the police power is merely suggested. Nothing is said of its application to procedure in general, or to state action in the regulation of business and industry, of hours of labor and conditions of work. The whole discussion serves less to present a well-rounded view of the meaning of due process than to illustrate how its meaning has been construed in some particular cases.

Occasionally careless or confusing statements are to be found but most of them are of minor importance. For example, no one will be misled by the statement (p. 262) that a guilty person, after sentence by the judge, is "then placed in charge of the executive branch of the government;" but one is somewhat bewildered to learn, on page 11, that the American nation was created by the signing of the declaration of independence and then read later (p. 26) that it was the phrase "We the people of the United States" in the preamble of the constitution that made the United States a nation. The confusion grows on analysis of the definition of a nation, given on page 12, where the term is said to imply "independence of any other sovereign power, an organized government, more or less absolute, recognized officials, a sys-

tem of laws, definite boundaries and the power to enter into negotiations with other nations."

As a reminder of how wisely our forefathers planned our system of constitutional government and as a statement of just what that plan really was the volume will prove to be most useful particularly for general readers. The style is clear, the terminology devoid of technical phrases, and the arrangement especially well adapted for reference.

C. O. Gardner

Social history of the American family. From colonial times to the present. I. In colonial times. II. From independence through the civil war. By Arthur W. Calhoun, Ph. D. In three volumes. (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark company, 1917, 1918. 348, 390 p. $5.00 net each)

The comprehensive purpose of this three-volume work is stated by the author in the preface to the first volume. "The three volumes of which this is the first are an attempt to develop an understanding of the forces that have been operative in the evolution of family institutions in the United States. They set forth the nature of the influences that have shaped marriage, controlled fecundity, determined the respective status of father, mother, child, attached relative and servant, influenced sexual morality, and governed the function of the family as an educational, economic, moral, and spiritual institution as also its relation to state, industry, and society in general in the matter of social control. The work is primarily a contribution to genetic sociology."

The first volume covers the colonial period. It describes the origin of the American family as it was rooted in European customs and folkways, and the adaptation of this traditional background to the economic and social life of a new continent. In the first volume the method of approach is primarily geographical. The features of family life in New England, in New York, in Pennsylvania, in New Jersey, in Delaware, the south, and the French west are taken up in the various chapters.

Certain outstanding features characterize family life in all the colonies, accompanied by striking variation in detail. Prominent among these characteristics is the influence of the economic factor in family organization. The vigorous economic pressure of colonial life in New England was seen in child labor. Children were employed in both agriculture and manufacturing. Higgeson, in *New England's plantation,* was delighted that child labor was an economic asset in agriculture. The people of Rowley were praised because their children were set to work spinning wool (p. 124). Child labor is described as a logical outgrowth of the puritan disapproval of idleness, the necessity for an economic margin, and the exploitation of a ruling aristocracy. Another significant characteristic of family conditions in colonial times was the

presence of a high birth rate and a high mortality of children. One Massachusetts man died leaving alive one hundred fifty-seven children and grandchildren. An inscription on a Plymouth gravestone is suggestive of the mortality of child-life. "Here lies ———— with twenty small children." (p. 89)

The author has collected an extraordinary amount of material regarding the origin and development of the American family. The usability of the material might be largely increased at times. The individual volumes are not indexed. The bibliography is alphabetically arranged and does not readily suggest sources for a given topic, and does not indicate the relative value of the sources named. The geographical method of organizing data (by states or groups of states) does not add to conciseness in discussing a single topic. Perhaps the author's purpose was too inclusive. At any rate, in this first volume, one completes his reading with a lack of clearness of thought in regard to the problem of organizing the material, and the conviction that a more unified arrangement would be possible. But to suggest such an arrangement would require considerable familiarity with the subject matter involved.

Throughout the volume one is impressed with the amazing amount of tradition, regulation, and convention which governs family life, and the question is raised whether or not there will ever be much individual freedom regarding sex matters and family relationship. The tenacity of tradition, regulation, and convention in our present time does not lead us to believe that the time for individual freedom in sex affairs is close at hand.

The second volume, covering the period from independence through the civil war, deals with four primary factors of family development: the influence of pioneering and the frontier, the growth of urban industrialism, the growth of city luxury with conspicuous consumption, and the culmination of the chattel slave system (Introduction to volume II). Some of the specific and particular subjects discussed are marriage and fecundity, emancipation of childhood, the emergence of woman, sex morals, the racial factor in the south, and the effects of the civil war.

As in the colonial period so from that time until the close of the civil war the significant character of the economic factor in family organization is easily traced. The free land of the west made all social relations mobile and the family felt to some extent this unsettling of traditional foundations. There was some laxity in regard to legal forms and changes. New opinions were formed in regard to the right of freedom in sex relations. Economic opportunity tended to throw children upon their own resources and opened the way for the emancipation of youth.

In the southern family the factor of slavery exercised great influence upon sex morals and family relationships.

In this second period we see the emergence of some of the problems which are now present in acute form or are well started on their way toward solution. One of the interesting phases of the time was the development of the woman's rights movement. The first organized meeting to formulate a declaration of woman's rights (held at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848) protested vigorously against the unjust legal conditions which practically held women in legal bondage. It was not until a later period, however, that the growing spirit of liberalism freed women from these severe legal restrictions and brought them from a state of subordination to a status more nearly upon the basis of sex mutuality.

The second volume has more unity and cohesion in its make-up than the first. The modern problems of the family are clearly foreseen. The third volume which is yet to appear gives promise of great interest, when the problems of the family as we know it are to be discussed.

JAMES G. STEVENS

History of transportation in the United States before 1860. Prepared under the direction of Balthasar Henry Meyer by Caroline E. MacGill and a staff of collaborators. [Contributions to American economic history from the department of economics and sociology, Carnegie institution of Washington] (Washington: Carnegie institution, 1917. 676 p. $6.00)

It has been said that the history of the railroads is the history of the United States. Whether this statement be true or not it is certain that the early history of the west must be stated very largely in terms of transportation. This fact is brought out clearly in the volume under review, the most comprehensive work which has yet appeared on this subject. It is one of the first three or four volumes to appear of the coöperative economic history of the United States, originally projected by the American economic association and now financed by the Carnegie institution at Washington. A dozen or more preliminary studies were made by independent investigators, and these together with a mass of other material were entrusted to Miss MacGill to combine into a unified whole. Under such circumstances the volume is rather uneven, being much fuller on some phases and periods than on others, and the treatment is encyclopedic rather than popular or literary. But Miss MacGill has performed her task in a careful and scholarly fashion, and the result is a compendious if not absolutely complete survey of the subject.

Since the treatment is largely topical and no attempt is made to cover

the colonial period, the first chapter, devoted to trails and roads, introduces the reader at once to the roads to and in the west. This is followed by other chapters on natural waterways, canals, plank roads, and railroads, each of these being usually described for the New England, middle, southern, and western states. The necessity of improved facilities for transportation in all pioneer communities, due to their need both for markets and for the capital and commodities of industrially more developed regions, and their zeal in promoting undertakings to supply these improvements, are illustrated by many examples. A concise yet sympathetic account of internal improvements in the western states is given. The importance of the introduction of the steamboat on western rivers and of its success in navigating upstream finds clear recognition.

About half the volume is devoted to the history of railways, which is a reasonable proportion as the study ends with 1860. The canal held its own fairly well until the end of the forties and the rivers were still important rivals of the railway at the close of the period considered. The almost complete displacement of these other agencies of transportation by the railways — with the exception of the great lakes — belongs to the period since 1860. In connection with the railways some attention is given to construction, charters, rates, securities, and similar matters. A forty page bibliography and five specially drawn maps conclude the volume.

This study seems to be more truly coöperative than any of the volumes in this series which have yet been issued. Nevertheless it is evident that much original work has been done by Miss MacGill and to her credit must be given for the finished product. Perhaps its shortcomings evidence the need of further special studies before a complete and definitive history of this vast subject can be written. The need of utilizing all available material makes the more regrettable the omission of all reference to W. H. Brownson's valuable *History of the Illinois Central railroad before 1870.*

E. L. Bogart

The story of corn and the western migration. By Eugene Clyde Brooks, professor of education, Trinity college, Durham, N. C. (Chicago: Rand, McNally and company, 1916. 308 p. $1.00)

The advance of civilization along the lines of industry, manufacturing, and commerce, has gradually tended to obscure the basic relation between agriculture and the structure of life. Recent events have rather sharply recalled this to public attention and the result has been a generally aroused interest in agrarian conditions. The expression has taken various forms, one of which is a developing of the history of agri-

culture. *The story of corn* is a study addressed to school children, chronicling the part the cereals, particularly maize, have played in the growth of the United States, with the object of creating an appreciation of the importance of agriculture in the evolution of the race.

After an exposition in the introductory chapters on the value of food to civilization, the author considers the significance of the discovery of corn for the settlement of the new world, the opening up of the great corn states of the Mississippi valley, the influence of the improvements in transportation and agricultural machinery in increasing the cultivation and sale of corn, the relation of corn to the live stock industry, the prosperity of the corn regions, the growth in domestic consumption and the necessity for large crops, the farm demonstration movement, the varieties and by-products of corn, and the position of corn in the world today. The narrative, set in clear type and illustrated with well selected pictures, maps, charts, and statistics, is written in a popular, readable style and accompanied by a suitable index. The most interesting portion of the book is that dealing with the work of Mr. Seaman A. Knapp and the corn clubs in the south.

Certain faults in the presentation render the narrative less valuable in the hands of teacher or pupil than the possibilities suggested in the subject. Lack of proportion in the emphasis on the value of corn as compared with other cereals, an occasional tendency to generalize where generalization is at best a half-truth, a too frequent repetition of words and ideas, the lack of references for quotations, and the brevity and inclusion of certain ill-chosen items in the bibliography, cause passing reflection in the mind of the careful reader.

The story of corn accomplishes its purpose of depicting the importance of agriculture; as a pathbreaker in recording the annals of maize, it leaves much to be desired. Instead of writing from a predominating viewpoint, such as the historical, economic, or agricultural, the author consciously presents all three at varying times, with a resulting inadequacy for any one of them. The book contains many historical elements, but is in no sense a thorough historical study.

HERBERT A. KELLAR

Abraham Lincoln. An address by Clark Prescott Bissett, professor of law, University of Washington, Seattle. (Los Angeles, California: Cannell, Smith, Chaffin company, 1916. 56 p. $2.00)

This slender volume, a reprint of an address on Lincoln, is well worth the reader's time. That the author is fully aware of the magnitude of an undertaking which contemplates anything like an exhaustive interpretation of Lincoln's character is at once apparent, for in speaking of

the volumes on this subject he says: "not one of them written as they are out of the best heart's love, compares with the man Lincoln, or begins to shine with his illimitable personality. . . Such a man is beyond description."

Conscious of limitations, therefore, Mr. Bissett does not attempt the character sketch which one might expect but confines himself to the task of showing that justice or love — "there is no difference in the quality or quantity of these two words" for "an earthly being whose motive power is justice will do exactly the same things under the same circumstances as one whose motive power is love" — was the dominating quality in the personality of the great president. Possibly it is the author's legal training which leads him to accept the former term in preference to the latter and to conclude that "the one attribute of Abraham Lincoln that ruled his being like a central sun was Justice." The arguments which he brings forward to support this choice, however, seem to emphasize the quality which the author deems of the lesser importance. Of this we are certain — that the justice to which he alludes is, and must be, something far beyond mere legal justice which is measured by the standards of man-made law. None will deny that when occasion required Lincoln displayed a highly developed conception of legal justice, but the justice which he made a rule of life was infinitely broader, being the justice found in the teachings of Jesus. To any interpretation less liberal than this the average reader will not subscribe. Lincoln's boundless mercy, his profound and sympathetic knowledge of human nature, his deep love for humanity which drew no distinction between black and white, bond and free, friend and enemy, can never be compressed within narrower limits.

Waiving the question of comparative merits of the terms employed and accepting the broad construction of justice which the author evidently had in mind, it can be said safely that this little book is worthy of a place in the literature illustrative of the personality of that "kindly-earnest, brave, farseeing man, . . . the first American."

William V. Pooley

Colonial Virginia, its people and customs. By Mary Newton Stanard. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott company, 1917. 376 p. $6.00)

Dwelling houses of Charleston, South Carolina. By Alice R. Huger Smith and D. E. Huger Smith. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott company, 1917. 380 p. $7.50)

Early Philadelphia, its people, life and progress. By Horace Mather Lippincott. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott company, 1917. 340 p. $6.00 net)

Even the casual reader can not but be interested in the series of books being published by J. B. Lippincott company which treats in a specific and popular form of the intimate side of early life in our oldest colonies and cities. This attempt to familiarize present day readers with our colonial period in an especial way is a worthy one.

Two volumes of this series appeared in September last, one on the *Dwelling houses of Charleston*, the second on *Early Philadelphia, its people, life, and progress*; and a third, entitled *Colonial Virginia, its people and customs* was published in October.

To many people the very fact that something is old gives it an interest, and this feeling would extend to a book treating of old objects, but when the discussion involves a point of general interest and of particular value, then the writer may claim to have done something conceded by most students to be worth while.

The authors of *Dwelling houses of Charleston* have achieved this distinction and have sought for this compilation a broader excuse than mere age. As set forth in the preface, they have endeavored to consider these buildings from an architectural viewpoint and to lay stress upon the interesting fact that although modified by new suggestions yet a distinctive style of architecture has been maintained. From this viewpoint the book has a distinct value that it could not have had if the buildings had been considered simply because they were old.

Charleston, or Charles Town as it was first called, was founded in 1670; and the style of architecture was mainly that of the English middle class of that period: "square in plan and laid out symmetrically" — a style that lent itself admirably to the climatic conditions which, the evidence shows, played no small part in developing the character of architecture. "Everything peculiar to the buildings of this place is formed to moderate the excessive heat: the windows are open, the doors pass through both sides of the houses. Every endeavor is used to refresh the apartment within with fresh air." One of the oldest houses standing was built some time prior to 1733 and typifies a general style of building which prevailed and which is still a favorite, with modifications of modern taste. The interiors of these dwellings were often

beautifully panelled and ornamented with carved woodwork. After the revolution the buildings show the influence of Adam; circular or elliptical rooms were a feature; and the introduction of projections and applied decorations added variance though without wholly supplanting the carvings. In the nineteenth century we are told there was a revival of the Greek style which was "intermingled with the two fashions that preceded it, the whole welded together by that dominance of climatic and local needs" heretofore mentioned.

An interesting point is emphasized: that this continuity of buildings throughout the existence of Charleston has been mainly due to the fact that reaction from the war between the states was slow and halting and the inhabitants have continued to live in the locality and homes built by their predecessors rather than remove to remote parts of the city and build so-called fashionable sections, as has been done in other cities of rapid growth. In Charleston the newer homes have been built alongside the older ones and conform to the general scheme of architecture, thus the earlier dwellings hold their own as pretentious and fashionable residences. This fact, the writer claims, is from an artistic point of view advantageous.

The illustrations are numerous, well chosen and beautifully executed; they show exterior views and setting interspersed with interior views of special features. The last two chapters are given over to building materials and costs, and here the illustrations are detailed drawings of the iron work of balconies, doorways, lamps, and other details both intricate and beautiful. The photographs and architectural drawings are the work of Albert Simons.

In addition to the main purpose there is also much of historical interest, the book as a whole being harmonious. It is particularly gratifying as a piece of bookmaking, a credit to both compiler and publisher.

A striking contrast to this city of the south both in the character of its founders and of its buildings is presented by *Early Philadelphia.* Founded in religious persecution, the city's origin lends of necessity to its buildings, customs, and institutions a religious atmosphere and an air of Quaker simplicity, dignity, and decorum which even present day progress has not greatly disturbed. The author says: "Her traditions and opinions of yesterday are maintained with a solidarity of thought which recalls their lessons and builds slowly but surely with clear perspective and the saving grace of modesty."

That Philadelphia was founded by Quakers who were artisans rather than adventurers the author shows would account for the "important and peculiar customs and institutions" which originated in Philadelphia before they developed elsewhere in the colonies; and these customs and

institutions, he believes, by retaining their solidarity and dependableness are serving as useful a purpose today as in early times, without losing their uniqueness.

The buildings illustrated are stately, but without ornamentation. The early Philadelphians built their homes for comfort, and the "Spirit of Christ" as practiced by the Quakers was found in silence and meditation free from the barriers of outward or worldly show. We find that one David Breintnall built one of the finest good houses in Philadelphia, but, "deeming it too fine for his Quaker persuasion he let it to the governor of Barbadoes who came to Philadelphia for his health."

For the most part this work by Mr. Lippincott is almost wholly descriptive. Seemingly no attempt has been made to set forth any special feature or prove any interpretation. His sole aim seems to be to set forth in an attractive and interesting way facts about the founding of Philadelphia and its various interests and institutions—a guide book to Philadelphia, as it were, though it is too bulky to be carried about for this purpose by the traveler.

The market place, that most fascinating feature of all early settlements and particularly of this city; the municipal government; the stage coaches and post roads; the parks, theatres, taverns; the university, colleges, and schools; banks, fire protection, and so on, are all featured. Credit is also given to Philadelphia for being the mother of several of our most valuable institutions, among them the first scientific society of the new world, organized in 1743; it was then known as a movement for "Promoting useful knowledge among the British plantations in America." It was founded by no less a personage than Benjamin Franklin and is now known as the American philosophical society. Again we find Philadelphia leading the new world in the advancement of science by the Philadelphia academy of natural science, the oldest institution of its kind in America, founded in 1812. The "City troops" which at the outbreak of hostilities with England was recruited from the various organizations for sport and social life among Philadelphia's gentry has not been so extended as the other organizations but is widely known as the first organization of volunteers formed to maintain the rights of the American citizens. In November, 1774, while the continental congress sat in session these volunteers associated themselves as the "light horse" of Philadelphia. This city was also early in the movement to abolish slavery. As early as 1688 a protest against slavery was made by Francis Daniel Postorius and his comrades, and such action became a part of the yearly meetings after 1696, growing in favor until in 1774 the "Pennsylvania society for promoting the abolition of

slavery and the relief of free negroes unlawfully held in bondage'' was organized, the first organization against this practice.

Thus are recounted the claims of Philadelphia for distinction, and Mr. Lippincott feels that Quaker heritage has given to customs and institutions peculiarities which have afforded the advertising value which innumerable commodities carry today. On the whole, I think the reader will feel that Mr. Lippincott has achieved his avowed purpose ''to bring together many fragmentary and scattered accounts of important and peculiar customs and institutions'' of Philadelphia.

Another work dealing with ''Ye olden time,'' and for which material has been taken from original sources, is the extensive work of Mrs. Mary Newton Stanard entitled *Colonial Virginia, its people and customs.*

The position of Mr. Stanard as secretary of the Virginia historical society has given Mrs. Stanard a valuable opportunity for gathering the material from documentary sources and for obtaining in many instances actual photographs of the original subjects illustrated. That she has made good use of her opportunities is evidenced by the many references to original material.

Mrs. Stanard's idea has been to give a more intimate insight into the home life of colonial Virginia than is usually to be found in a broader treatment of its history, and for this purpose she has carefully drawn her material from letters, diaries, wills, and other sources giving personal details. From personal knowledge the reviewer knows how interesting can be these minor details which too often must be omitted in a broader treatment.

The first chapter, covering some forty pages, is devoted to the founders of the colony and later immigrants, their difficulties, and genealogy. The second and third chapters describe the homes and household goods, and again we find comment on the woodcarving with which the interiors were decorated as also on the ornamental doorways, cornices, and other details of workmanship which the writer speaks of as artistic masterpieces and for which she claims a place in the annals of American art.

To the social life is given most space, and ample evidence is produced that ''the foundation of all social life is the family.'' There was little opportunity in early times for social life and entertainment outside the home. Hospitality was extended unstintingly, and from the entries in diaries it would seem a continuous house party was the custom in the well to do families to such an extent that Virginia hospitality has become proverbial. A traveler needed no recommendation save that of being a human being, and Mrs. Stanard finds many indications that ''in the vocabulary of the Virginian there was no such word as snob.''

Chapters on courtship and marriage, dress, the theatre, and sports follow the social life and in a chapter entitled ''Virginia and England''

is shown the intimate relation that existed between the colony and England, which was still "home" to the colonial Virginian. Intimate business, social, and family relations were continued for many years even to the extent of the English ladies shopping for their kinsmen and friends in Virginia. The cultural life is set forth in several chapters including education, books, music, and religion, the book closing with a chapter on funeral customs. That moral and intellectual training in Virginia was not lacking is evidenced by the status of those who at the close of the colonial period were ready to assume the responsibility of a new and independent nation.

If history is chiefly interesting when it is personal, then Mrs. Stanard has large claims for recognition; her book is a continuous recital of personal details, a hybrid between an inventory of a museum of personal property and a genealogical record. The book is an admirable example of what it claims to be, the intimate side of the personal life of colonial Virginia, and will furnish material for investigators in several fields, history, genealogy, and architecture.

IDRESS HEAD ALVORD

Trade of the Delaware district before the revolution. By Mary Alice Hanna. [Smith college studies in history, edited by John Spencer Bassett, Sidney Bradshaw Fay, volume II, no. 4] (Northampton: Smith college, 1917. 113 p. $.50)

This excellent study begins very properly with a clear account of the economic conditions in the Delaware district before 1763. The trade boundaries of the time are accurately drawn and the determinant factors of the direction of trade shown. An otherwise clear account seems clouded on pages 245-246 by a few misplaced paragraphs on tariff legislation. Clearness, however, is quickly resumed by the disclosure that the district was more or less isolated from the mother country because it was principally controlled by the government of Pennsylvania and was of undesirable economic character when considered from the mercantile view-point. The products and industries of the district are next shown by one who has clearly mastered her sources on these points and gives the results of her study with due balance, relegating to her footnotes in proper manner much of the detail. A clear account of the trade routes before 1763 follows, disclosing ability in the handling of sources from which a less able student would have been unable to extract the meat with satisfaction to the reader.

In noting the presentation, thereafter, in chapter two, a study of the British legislation of 1763-1773 with such an exhaustive scholarship the reviewer becomes almost convinced that he is reading a work devoted

exclusively to a study of English trade administration. Can it be successfully maintained that the otherwise clean-cut study of the trade of a particular district is not interrupted by such an elaborated study of legislation so appropriate in a book confined to a general treatment of trade administration?

The last chapter on the effect of the British legislation, though well done, covers colonial trade in general and often loses for the reader any clear view of the Delaware district. The chapter might very properly be included in a general study on British trade administration. Evidently an elimination of part of this material, which takes one too far afield, would enable the writer to impress the reader more convincingly of her conclusion that the legislation was economically untenable for the Delaware district.

There can be no questioning the fact that the author has very thoroughly and profitably studied widely in the public record office, the British museum, the house of lords, Bodleian library, All Soul's college, and in the Pennsylvania historical society library, as her well-arranged bibliography attests.

R. B. Way

Revolution in Virginia. By H. J. Eckenrode, Ph. D., associate professor of economics and history, Richmond college. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1916. 311 p. $2.00 net)

Because the historians of the revolution have chosen to center their narratives around the deliberations of the continental congress and the campaigns of the continental army such important phases of the general movement as the development of the revolutionary spirit within the several colonies and the creation of the new American states have not been accorded their proper emphasis. This volume, as the title indicates, is an attempt to remedy the defect, in part at least, by an examination of the events connected with the birth and progress of the revolution in the most populous and possibly the most conservative of the English colonies in America.

Owing to the fact that New Englanders were convinced that the revenue policy of the British government was threatening the life of their local industries and interfering with the prosperity of their merchants, the revolution in these colonies was primarily economic in character and was dominated by the middle class. In Virginia, on the other hand, it was almost entirely political in origin and although in time the great body of the people came to be involved, the local gentry and not the political demagogues shaped its course.

Manifestations of Virginia's independent, self-reliant spirit which

were already noticeable before 1700 came to be much more clearly defined in the following century as a result of the rapid increase in the wealth, population, and culture of the colony. Not, however, until the upland counties had gained materially in political strength and, under the leadership of Patrick Henry, had begun to exert an influence in the house of burgesses far more radical than that wielded by the more cautious leaders of the tidewater communities, did the smoldering spirit of independence show itself in the form of open defiance of parliamentary control. From this date, 1765, there were two more or less clearly defined parties in Virginia: the conservatives, headed by the old leaders, and the democrats or progressives led by Patrick Henry and Richard Henry Lee. Even though party names did not exist there was, nevertheless, true party action; and the opponents, although agreeing in the main on constitutional matters, were at variance as to the ways and means of attaining the ends sought. Accordingly as one faction or the other was in power the revolution either lagged or went forward rapidly. Moreover, as a consequence of this alignment into political parties a revolution developed within the greater movement. First, there was the general opposition to the spread of English imperialism in which Virginia joined with the other colonies; and, second, an internal upheaval directed against the existing social organization. This local movement resulted in the formation of the democratic party which was to spread beyond the confines of the commonwealth and ultimately to raise Jefferson to the presidency.

When the house of burgesses, after having been dissolved by Governor Dunmore, came together informally and provided for the calling of a convention to meet at Williamsburg, the revolution actually began in Virginia. The convention, which in reality was only a legislative body, proceeded in August, 1775, to create an executive, openly revolutionary in character, and to endow this committee of safety with power to levy and equip troops, gather munitions of war, and to enter negotiations with other colonies for military support, thereby committing Virginia irrevocably to participation in the armed resistance which had already begun in the northern colonies.

The planter class entered the struggle reluctantly and with no thought of separation from England. Many of these tidewater gentlemen, although watchfully jealous of their rights as Englishmen, were at the same time proud of their Anglican connections and sought to retain these by exerting upon the mother country economic pressure of sufficient weight to convince her statesmen of the folly of any attempt to tighten the bonds of imperialism in America. To this end the continental association founded upon the doctrine of non-intercourse had been formed and given a trial. When this measure failed to give re-

lief and separation was known to be inevitable the internal revolution developed. The conservative planters who had not been inclined to welcome independence, or even war, because in these events they saw the failure of their own particular form of resistance, at last became partially reconciled to the situation and went forward in the hope that separation might be effected without involving the destruction of the framework of colonial institutions either social or political. That is, they hoped to retain their old position of leadership with the additional advantage of being relieved of English interference in governmental affairs. To another class in Virginia, — the poor people, — the revolution meant more than mere resistance to England. It awakened a spirit of antagonism against the whole social and political order and fostered the hope that in revolution there might be a reorganization of society within the colony which would accord them a larger share in the government and a higher standard of comfort as well. The participation of this class in the movement marks the end of the period which was characterized by a conservative attempt to abate English encroachments upon colonial liberty.

After independence came the formulation of the state constitution and the formation of the state, — just at the time when the progressive group was in the ascendancy. Patrick Henry, an ardent democrat and a political agitator without a peer, was the first governor. He was followed by Jefferson in 1779, when Virginia assumed all the characteristics of a permanent democratic state. As a governor Jefferson was a failure. He went into office a popular leader but because of a combination of unfortunate conditions and unexpected events over which he may possibly have had no control, he experienced a most unsatisfactory administration and in the end narrowly escaped impeachment. Peace did much to settle the widespread unrest which prevailed but it also brought into bolder relief the question of continuing the experiment in democracy which the new state had entered upon. The conservatives had long awaited the time when they could make a successful attack upon the democrats. Favorable opportunities might appear either when their opponents should be discredited politically in the eyes of the people, or when the war, so subversive of social distinctions, had ceased. The failure of the Jefferson administration afforded one opportunity; the coming of peace, another. Full advantage was taken of neither and in the years immediately following democratic social and political ideals prevailed.

The military operations of the revolution as they affected Virginia are given adequate treatment as is the turmoil caused by the increased activities of the tories towards the close of the war. But the main thread of the narrative is devoted to the development of the internal revolution

which was so significant during these years of Virginia's history.

The book is an exceptionally good one; it is well written and interesting; it furnishes abundant evidence of careful study; it is a contribution to the literature of the revolution; and at no time does the reader get the impression that it is the result of mere mental gymnastics. The lack of a bibliography is a disappointment for aside from the few footnotes which show the sources of some of the materials used we are given only the author's statement that "the present work is chiefly based on the original sources of information in the archives of the Virginia State Library."

William V. Pooley

Georgia as a proprietary province. The execution of a trust. By James Ross McCain, Ph.D., professor of American history, Agnes Scott College. (Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1917. 357 p. $2.50 net)

Several years ago the earlier chapters of this study were privately printed by the author for presentation to Columbia university as a doctoral dissertation, the work having been done under the guidance of Professor Osgood. Those chapters are here revised and five new chapters added, so that the present volume is practically new. The ground covered by Mr. McCain has already been worked by earlier Georgia historians, notably by William B. Stevens and Charles C. Jones. Both these writers were excellent historians, but neither had at hand the materials used by Mr. McCain, and, furthermore, it was time for a new interpretation, since Stevens and Jones wrote, respectively, sixty and thirty-five years ago.

Mr. McCain makes no attempt to trace in detail the current of events in the proprietary period of Georgia. His purpose is rather to picture the workings of the corporation or trust as an organizing and administrative body. Hence he discusses at length the personnel of the board, evaluating their respective services to the colony; recounts their political activities, made necessary by the relation of the trustees to the government of the British empire; describes the creation and activities of the "common council," a sort of committee within the general corporation, and distinguishes the functions of the two bodies; makes plain the struggle to keep clear of the board of trade, which was busily extending its control over the colonies; discusses fully the legislation of the trustees for the colony; and gives interesting details of the task of finding financial support for the venture. An excellent chapter handles the relations of Oglethorpe to the trustees and to the administration of affairs in Georgia — the only critical estimate we have of Oglethorpe. His status is shown to have been, throughout his connection with the colony,

that of an agent with strictly limited and constantly diminishing powers: he never wielded the powers enjoyed by the royal governors and never had that title. Another commendable chapter traces the history of the peculiar system of land distribution, making clear for the first time many knotty points.

The proprietary era of Georgia is an excellent field for monographic study, since the period covers only twenty years and practically all the known documentary material is available. Large masses of these records, taken from the British public records office, have been published by the state of Georgia in the series known as the *Colonial records*. Many volumes of manuscripts are still in the hands of the state compiler awaiting publication. All this material, published and in manuscript form, has been used by Mr. McCain; indeed it constitutes his principal resource; he is the first person who has made adequate use of it.

The volume is equipped with a bibliography of the manuscript and published sources, as well as the small number of secondary works cited. There are remarkably few of the slips that usually find their way into first editions, none worth pointing out.

R. P. Brooks

Official letter books of W. C. C. Claiborne, 1801-1816. Edited by Dunbar Rowland, B.S., LL.B., LL.D., director Mississippi department of archives and history. In six volumes. (Jackson: State department of archives and history, 1917. 394 p.; 394 p.; 399 p.; 423 p.; 400 p.; 468 p. $36.00 per set)

One of the most important and interesting phases of American history is that of the territorial expansion of the United States. Leaving out of consideration the territory already held at the close of the revolutionary war, this expansion may be said to date from the purchase, in 1803, of the vast area called Louisiana. The history of the government of our first foreign-acquired territory, so fruitful in precedents for after years, is of peculiar significance. From the point of view of the historian, it is in many ways fortunate that the southern part of the Louisiana purchase, the territory of Orleans, had but one governor, and he a prolific letter writer.

William Charles Cole Claiborne had already served his apprenticeship as governor of Mississippi territory (1801-1803) when President Jefferson ordered him, together with General James Wilkinson, to proceed to New Orleans and receive Louisiana from the French officials. Appointed at first only as provisional governor of the new acquisition, Claiborne became in 1804 governor of Orleans territory, which office he held for the entire territorial period (1804-1812), and upon the admission of the

state of Louisiana into the union, his faithful service was rewarded by election as state governor. In January, 1817, he was elected to the United States senate, but died in November of that year.

Mr. Rowland has rendered investigators of American history a valuable service by editing Claiborne's *Letter books.* Although the letters cover the period from 1801 to 1816, the bulk of them pertain to the government of Orleans territory (1804-1812). Claiborne took his task seriously, and his many letters to federal officials in Washington reflect his anxieties and difficulties. Inability to speak either French or Spanish, the language of the majority of his civilized charges, was a serious handicap, but on the whole it was perhaps American settlers such as Edward Livingston and Daniel Clark who worried him most. Questions of government, both federal and local, boundary disputes with the Spaniards, Indian matters, Burr's conspiracy, and the British invasion were phases of his problems.

In his introduction to the *Letter books,* the editor dismisses the Claiborne papers in the bureau of rolls and library of the department of state in Washington with the curt remark that they are "incomplete copies of the originals in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History." Just how the letters of a territorial governor to the secretary of state can be characterized in this fashion would require some explanation. Furthermore, an examination of the Washington collection would have enabled Mr. Rowland to fill in several large *lacunae* in his edition. For purposes of comparison the investigator would be wise to consult David W. Parker, *Calendar of papers in Washington archives relating to the territories of the United States.*

For the gap in the *Letter books* (1:284), extending from March 27 to November 8, 1803, Parker (338-339) offers but little assistance. For the blank (3:36) from December 31, 1804, to May 4, 1805, however, Parker (352-356) lists about seventy items. No note or explanation is offered by Mr. Rowland to show that he had noticed that letters were missing.

In volume III, page 238, is a note stating, "Manuscript missing up to January 11, 1806." The last item entered is under date of November 25, 1805. Parker (362-363) lists over twenty documents between these dates.

Again, in the same volume (3:369), in the middle of a letter of July 15, 1806, to Jefferson, the note, "Manuscript torn," appears twice, and then the document continues, although obviously not the same letter. An examination of the Jefferson papers in the manuscripts division of the library of congress discloses the fact that the torn manuscript represents the absence of parts of two letters and one whole one, totalling

approximately eight large pages. (Letters to Jefferson, second series, 19: nos. 49, 50, 51.)

In volume IV, pages 123-143, there are many documents missing which are listed by Parker (369-371). In volume V, pages 24-34, Rowland has five entries for the year 1810, prior to December 1; Parker (378-380) has over thirty.

In all fairness it ought to be stated that Mr. Rowland has, in turn, published many documents which are not mentioned by Parker (especially 4:1-74; 5:166-222). Since the Claiborne papers in the state department do not extend, except for a few scattered letters, beyond 1812, when Louisiana became a state, the sixth volume of the Rowland edition, covering the period to 1816, becomes in consequence all the more valuable. Then, too, many important letters between Claiborne and local officials did not find their way to Washington, and here, again, the Rowland collection adds distinctly to our knowledge.

Mr. Rowland, for some reason or other, has not mentioned in the *Letter books* his own previous publications relative to the Claiborne material. In *The Mississippi territorial archives* (1:342-603) will be found Claiborne's letters as governor of Mississippi territory; while in the *Third annual report of the director of the department of archives and history of the state of Mississippi* (106-169), Mr. Rowland has published Claiborne's correspondence concerning the Burr conspiracy. In his *First annual report* (pp. 23-39) and *Third annual report* (pp. 180-200, 212-234) Mr. Rowland has given lists or tables of contents of the Claiborne *Journals.* Significant mention of the *Journals* is contained also in the *Fourth annual report* (pp. 29-30) and *Eleventh and twelfth annual reports* (pp. 50-52). In the absence of a descriptive note and table of contents in the *Letter books,* the student will find all of the above citations helpful.

The volumes are neatly edited and are of a handy size. There is a good index, but, as has already been noted, no table of contents. It is somewhat confusing that the documents are not printed in exact chronological sequence. In the extended and useful list of parallel-printed and manuscript sources appended to volume VI, one looks in vain for either the *Memoirs* or the *Letters* of John Quincy Adams, a source of information too important to be ignored. Furthermore, in the light of the reviewer's own contribution of documents to the *American historical review* (22: 340-364), it can no longer be said, as is done by Mr. Rowland in this work (6:415) that the senate debate on the government of Orleans territory was not reported.

While details of editing will not here be entered into, a certain carelessness in reference to footnotes might be mentioned. In volume I,

page 284, is the footnote, "Beginning of volume II," but no corresponding number appears on the page. Again, in volume VI, page 31, at the bottom of the text is the figure "2," presumably for a note on West Florida, which the number follows, but no note is given. In volume III, page 363, one reads "one hundred 7 25 per cent." This is "an hundred and 25 per cent" in the copy of the letter in the library of congress (Jefferson papers. Letters to Jefferson, second series, 19: no. 47).

It is unfortunate that Mr. Rowland, in making available to students of American history and government so important a set of documents as the *Claiborne letter books,* did not greatly enhance the value of his contribution by making use of the archives in Washington, or at least by indicating where the missing papers were to be found; yet, despite its discrepancies, the edition of the *Claiborne letter books* will form a valuable mine of material for the investigator of American institutional government as well as for the history of the expanding southwest.

EVERETT S. BROWN

State regulation of railroads in the south. By Maxwell Ferguson, A.M., LL.B., sometime university fellow in political science, Columbia university, instructor in economics, Vassar college. [Studies in history, economics and public law, edited by the faculty of political science, Columbia university, whole no. 162, vol. LXVII, no. 2] (New York: Columbia university, London: P. S. King & Son, limited, 1916. 228 p. $1.75 net)

This monograph is confessedly fragmentary, being a small part of a much larger work planned by its author, and it is offered in its present form as an encouragement to students in southern colleges to undertake intensive studies of railway regulation in each of the states of the south. If the volume achieves this purpose its publication will be justified, but it falls short of meeting the needs of a serious student of the railway problem. "The south," as used in this study, refers to the territory south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi rivers; and the states of Arkansas, Texas, Maryland, and Missouri are therefore omitted.

In the first three chapters Mr. Ferguson discusses the chief provisions in the early railway charters, in the early general railway laws, and in the present state constitutions. He then analyzes and classifies railway legislation and finds that this has been voluminous but "distressingly incomplete," with scant attention to some of the most important phases of the problem. He notes a growing tendency toward increasing the powers of state railway commissions, toward regulating the service, and toward legislative, rather than commission control over rates. The development of the commissions is traced historically, with a separate chapter for each of eleven states, and the work is

brought to a close with a summary and survey of the present commission situation.

Mr. Ferguson concludes that for many years it was an open question whether the majority of southern commissions did not do more harm than good, but that within the past decade there has been a decided improvement, both in the efficiency of the commissioners and in the general attitude of the railway managers toward the question of public control. The commissioners, however, still manifest a regrettable tendency to adjust intrastate rates so as "to favor their own jobbers and producers at the expense of those of adjoining States." Moreover, they have been hampered in their work by meagre appropriations and their attempts at regulation have in general been neither expert nor intelligent. A saving feature of the situation is the steady decline of state in favor of federal regulation, as the volume of interstate traffic increases in relative importance.

The railway problems are discussed wholly from the administrative viewpoint, and it is to be hoped that other phases of these problems, such as the promotion, consolidation, and reorganization of southern railway systems, state aid (especially in the reconstruction period), and the conflict of state and federal jurisdictions, will be fully developed in the more elaborate treatise promised by the author.

William O. Scroggs

Wage bargaining on the vessels of the great lakes. By H. E. Hoagland, Ph.D., instructor in economics, University of Illinois. [University of Illinois studies in the social sciences, volume VI, number 3] (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1917. 123 p. $1.50)

This monograph consists of five chapters and three appendices. The chapter headings — Beginnings of organization, Growing concentration, Trade agreements, Disruption of the unions and open shop — indicate the various aspects discussed. The appendices — Wage bargaining on Lake Erie docks, Grain handlers' agreements, Wage bargaining in the lumber carrying industry — are short studies made while the writer was in the employ of the United States commission on industrial relations.

The study points out the general disorganization of labor and capital on the vessels of the great lakes previous to 1870, and after that date the conditions which made organization inevitable. Throughout the early period the captain either owned the vessel or at any rate was master of it. He acted independently of all other captains, and made the best terms he could with labor which though unorganized nevertheless because of scarcity received a high wage. The changed conditions after 1870 were due (1) to the building of the Sault Ste. Marie canal by the United States government, (2) to the increase in the shipment of iron ore,

and (3) to the change from the sail freighter to the steamboat. These changes taken together brought into existence boats with a larger tonnage, increased the relative importance of capital, and created for the first time a distinct capitalistic class. The owners both of the vessels and of ore, the principal commodity shipped, demanded regular and efficient service. In order to secure this service the independent captain was replaced by a manager or engineer responsible directly to ship owners. To deal effectively with labor, the Lake carriers' association was formed. This organization following the course dictated by expediency has at one time recognized the unions and made wage agreements with them. At another it has made war upon them, using every means known to the employer; it has forced the open shop and finally disrupted the union.

Labor in its losing fight was handicapped by the fact that the laborers because of the nature of the work were irresponsible and inefficient. Wage agreements consequently could not be kept. Neither could a consistent union policy be developed. These factors taken together with the additional facts, that aristocracy in labor existed, i.e., one group would not associate with or fight for another group, and also that agreements could not be reached upon the principles of organization, i.e., trade or industrialism, explain why in the long contest labor was defeated.

The study as a whole represents careful work. The form of presentation is good, the style clear, and the method scientific. The author, however, does not give a clear presentation of the methods of wage bargaining which John R. Commons does so well in his *Labor and administration.* Rather does he portray the struggle for some possible method of adjusting labor difficulties, though the former is what he attempts as stated in the first line of the preface. Care in proof reading would have avoided the following errors: Scaricty for scarcity, p. 10, line 27; Agrement for Agreement, p. 75, line 11, also p. 77, line 1; ben for been, p. 80, line 18. These are, howevere, minor criticisms and should not greatly detract from a meritorious work.

JUDSON F. LEE

Illinois in the fifties. A decade of development, 1851-1860. By Charles Beneulyn Johnson, M.D. (Champaign, Illinois: Flanigan-Pearson company, 1918. 180 p. $1.25 net)

In this book Dr. Johnson has wavered between the task of writing an intimate body of reminiscences and an attempt to tell the history of the decade he has chosen. This is unfortunate because it mars the many

excellencies of his little volume. In certain chapters he tries to survey the developments in national politics; in them one finds not the spirit of personal recollections but rather that of the post bellum prejudices of a northerner. This is evident in the references to the Mexican war and to other events. It need scarcely be said that they add little to our knowledge of the period. This is even true of the chapter entitled "Slavery and the Lincoln-Douglas debate," although it incorporates a few fragmentary reminiscences of other contemporaries.

Dr. Johnson's picture of social and industrial conditions is surely worth while, although it is marred by a tendency to make generalizations that would apply also, perhaps even better, to the period before 1850. This criticism might have been obviated had it been made clear that the statements were applied to one of the backward rural sections of the state. Certain of the illustrations are the cuts that were used to illustrate Buck's *Illinois in 1818*, which suggests that the author may not have had a keen enough time sense. The author may well have had in mind the neighborhood of his boyhood home, Amity or Pocahontas; this, however, he does not make clear nor does his title suggest it. Indeed, Pocahontas is not mentioned until after the first quarter of the book (p. 52) and then only scattered bits of information are furnished (p. 52, 54, 61, etc.) which might well have been fashioned together into a single picture. Chapter 2 describes Benjamin Jones, "a progressive pioneer," but the reader does not know in what part of Illinois he lived. Chapter 3, "The gold-seekers of the later forties," describes the circumstances of the discovery of gold in California rather than the movement of population from Illinois; the author does follow the journey of his father who met his death shortly after reaching Sacramento, but he takes no notice of the organized movement of gold-seekers. His description of the "village club," the country store, is interesting but gossipy. The chapters on sports and amusements, on the village lyceum, and other intimate glimpses into contemporary social conditions have real merit. It should be evident, therefore, that while this volume includes many of the weaknesses of its kind, it is not without a real value for Illinois history.

ARTHUR C. COLE

With Sam Houston in Texas. By Edwin L. Sabin. [The trail blazers series] (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and company, 1916. 320 p. $1.25 net)

This book is addressed to the interest of youthful readers, and for that reason Ernest Merrill, a fictitious boy, is somewhat obviously dragged through its pages, gazing admiringly at the hero and participating in

his adventures, which are confined to the period of the Texas revolution. In fact, the book is little more or less than the story of the revolution narrated in considerable degree in dialogue form. The writer adds little to its interest by imagination. He seems to have made a rather industrious study of his subject from the most accessible books and articles, and though the book contains many minor inaccuracies, he has followed his authorities with a good deal of fidelity. It is a stirring theme, and will no doubt meet the purpose for which it was written.

E. C. B.

History of Arizona. By Thomas Edwin Farish, Arizona historian. Volumes III and IV. (Phoenix: The state, 1916. $3.50 net)

Volumes I and II of this work were noticed in the MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW of September, 1916, when certain characteristics were pointed out, particularly a conspicuous lack of organization and the author's conception of history as a compilation of pioneer narratives and interviews. These qualities are carried consistently through the present volumes. A brief preface to volumes III and IV explains that the Arizona law creating the office of state historian requires him "to faithfully and diligently collect data of the events which mark the progress of Arizona from its earliest day to the present time, to the end that an accurate record may be preserved of those thrilling and heroic occurrences; that knowledge of the achievements of Arizona's trail blazers may not perish with the passing of her pioneers, but may be preserved and disseminated for the benefit of the present and future generations; that the names of those whose lives were and are identified with the establishment, the progress and the development of Arizona may be given just and lasting recognition." In the endeavor to comply "strictly with the letter of the law," says the historian, "I have gathered all authentic data obtainable, official and otherwise, relating to Arizona, and am embodying it in this History." The period covered by the two volumes is 1863-1868, and the list of chapter titles will give, perhaps, the fairest indication of the plan and contents of the books. Volume III contains: "Early opinions of Arizona," "Precious metals in Arizona," "Travels of Governor Goodwin's party," "Early territorial days," "The first territorial legislature" (two chapters), "Federal government's treatment of Arizona," "Early days of Prescott," "Conditions in Arizona in 1863 and 1864," "Population, early settlement, Indian troubles," "Indian troubles" (four chapters). Volume IV contains: "Conditions in 1865," "Early conditions in the territory" (three chapters), "The Arizona volunteer," "The Indians and the military" (two chapters), "The second legislative assembly," "The third

legislative assembly," "The courts," "Early settlements" (three chapters), "Mines and mining — possibilities of the territory — resumption of mail and stage lines," "The Catholic church in Arizona," "Early surveys," "The Colorado river Indian reservation." The volumes form an entertaining, but undiscriminating, source book, the raw materials for a history of Arizona; they probably fill the prescription of the statute which gave them birth, but they are not a history of Arizona.

E. C. B.

Taming of the Sioux. By Frank Fiske. (Bismarck, North Dakota: Bismarck Tribune, 1917, 186 p. $1.50)

The spectacular military history of the Sioux forms an exceptional basis for popular writing, and it is but natural that writers will from time to time relate the story in a popular vein. Such literature finds abundant outlet in the changing and increasing population of the northwest, especially in those states where the Siouan history is somewhat local. To this category belongs Mr. Fiske's book which recites in a general, non-technical yet readable way, the military history of the Sioux nation since the Minnesota massacre. No attempt is made at accurate detailed statement; in but few cases is authority given, and no new material is presented. The author's approach is from the angle of readability. It is free from bias and the reader does not detect a desire on the part of the author to champion either the cause of the Indian or of the white.

The story follows accepted history quite closely and it is comparatively free from wild extravagant statements which so frequently characterize popular western history. At times, however, the author does not resist the temptation to tell "a good one" as is illustrated by his story of the wagon box fight. The treatment of the battle of the Little Big Horn is far too general even for a popular history; undercurrents such as treaties, affairs on the reservations, and food hardly enter into the story.

The book is of but little value to the student of plains history, but if it serves to keep alive a healthy interest in local history in the northwest, it will answer a good purpose.

M. L. Wilson

Cruise of the Corwin. Journal of the arctic expedition of 1881 in search of De Long and the Jeannette. By John Muir, edited by William Frederic Badè. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1917. 279 p. $2.75 net)

Many persons still in active life recall vividly the tragic story of the *Jeannette* which, under the enthusiastic De Long in 1879 sailed through Behring straits into the Arctic ocean in quest of the north pole. The same autumn two vessels were missing also from the whaling fleet in the

north Pacific, and the following winter was so severe that an insistent demand was made upon congress and President Garfield for a relief expedition.

The *Corwin* was a finely built steamer in the service of the treasury department for the enforcement of federal laws for the protection of the fur seals and the sea-otters. The reports her commander brought back from the waters of Behring sea as a result of his trip in 1880 were disquieting, and when she sailed in 1881 it was with orders to seek information concerning the *Jeannette* and the missing whalers, and to extend to them any needed assistance. Fortunately Captain Hooper of the *Corwin* was a friend of Muir and urged him to go as naturalist.

Muir made up his mind on short notice to accept the unusual opportunity to visit the Arctic and wrote his mother as follows:

"I have been interested for a long time in the glaciation of the Pacific Coast, and I felt that I must make a trip of this sort to the Far North some time, and no better chance could in any probability offer. I am acquainted with our captain, and have every comfort the ship can afford, and every facility to pursue my studies. . . As the ice melts and breaks up, we will probably push eastward around Point Barrow, then return to the Siberian side to pick up our land party, then endeavor to push through the ice to the mysterious unexplored Wrangell Land."

Although Wrangell Land had been reported by whalers as early as 1867, yet, so far as records go, the party from the *Corwin* was the first to set foot on its barren shores; this they did August 12, 1881. Muir's narrative of the trip to the island, and to many other almost equally unknown points in Behring sea and the Arctic, is written in that clear, vivid style of which he was a recognized master. A portion of this account was published originally in Captain Hooper's report of the voyage of the *Corwin* which appeared as a senate executive document in 1884. But during the trip, Muir wrote a series of letters to the *San Francisco Evening Bulletin*, embodying the contents of his daily record, and these are made the basis of the present volume. To them has been added new matter from Muir's private journal, and notes from various sources.

Thus, while the major part of the material was in print, it has been heretofore inaccessible, and even at best so scattered that its use was not easy. In fact, one may doubt whether even those who seek for Muir's writings because of their pleasure in them have known of the material brought together here. As presented in a single volume, the work will be readily available to a wide circle of readers who could not have enjoyed it otherwise.

To the geologist, this volume will appeal because of its record of studies on glaciation; to the naturalist, it furnishes a wealth of information on

flora and fauna in a region even now little known; the student of primitive life among American and Asiatic peoples will rejoice to find accurate records of various tribes before they came into degrading contact with the white race. And all these accounts are presented with a charm in style and a clarity in statement that make Muir's work attractive and all but unique.

Mr. Badè, the editor, is to be congratulated on the success with which he has woven this material into a work that is a real unit, and that breathes throughout the admirable style of Muir, as if written in its present form by his hand. The utilization of Muir's sketches gives added interest and value to the work. Some of them, like those of Wrangell Land, are the only representations in existence of that little-known island.

Henry B. Ward

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Among those who attended the eleventh annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association at St. Paul and Minneapolis, May 9 to 1, the sentiment seemed to be unanimous that the committee on local arrangements was deserving of the greatest praise. Everything possible was done for the comfort and entertainment of those present. The numerous courtesies began on Thursday with a luncheon at the St. Paul association of business and public affairs, an automobile tour of the twin cities followed by tea at the university club of St. Paul in the afternoon, and a reception in the evening, tendered by the Minnesota historical society following the presidential address of Professor St. George L. Sioussat. Most of Friday was spent at the university of Minnesota where a luncheon was given by the university, and at a group dinner in the evening at the campus club the members of the history faculty of the university were hosts; following the evening session came a smoker at the Minnesota club of St. Paul. Saturday morning, upon the arrival of Professor Frederick J. Turner, a group breakfast was given in his honor at the St. Paul hotel; a luncheon on Saturday was tendered to the members of the Mississippi valley historical association by the St. Paul association, the Minnesota historical association, and the Twin City history teachers' club; Professor Thomas F. Moran, now of the committee on public information, Washington, D. C., gave the principal address, on "The fight for public opinion." Following the dedication of the new building erected by the state of Minnesota for the use of the Minnesota historical society, the building was open for inspection on Saturday afternoon; the inspection was followed by a supper served in the galleries of the historical building. Following the dedicatory address by Professor F. J. Turner, on "Middle western pioneer democracy," the building was again open for inspection. It may safely be said that the social functions were more numerous and better arranged than is normally the case at such meetings.

Considering the numerous financial demands made upon all at this time and the difficulties of travel, the meeting was very well attended. The geographical distribution represented in the persons in attendance was wider than had been expected. Many voiced the sentiment that the program of papers was an attractive one, with an interesting variety of subjects.

At the business meeting Professor Harlow Lindley of Earlham college

was elected president for the ensuing year. The executive committee voted to hold the next meeting of the association in St. Louis.

In the April, 1918, *Southwestern historical quarterly* Charles E. Chapman describes "The Native Sons fellowships." The Native Sons of the Golden West, a Californian fraternal society, has the unique distinction of devoting its energies and funds entirely to the promotion of California history; to this end two fellowships of $1500 each have, since 1911, been given annually to the university of California to be devoted to the study of state history in Spain or England; since the entrance of the United States into the war, four resident fellowships have been substituted for the two traveling fellowships.

The department of history at the university of California in coöperating with the Native Sons to initiate systematic research in California history secured Professor Herbert E. Bolton, specialist in the field of the former Spanish frontier, to have principal charge of graduate study. The fellowships themselves have been especially fruitful in productive work, though most of the volumes are still in process of publication by the university of California. It is noteworthy, however, that upon the investigations of the first fellow, Lawrence Palmer Briggs, depended in large degree the publication of Herbert Ingram Priestly's volume on *José de Galvez* — a work which has recently received such marked honor. The second Native Sons' fellow, Charles E. Chapman, was, upon his return from Spain, made the first instructor in the history of California at that university. In the March, 1918, number of the *Grizzly bear*, which is the official organ of the Native Sons and at the same time a magazine of California history, Mr. Chapman tells of his "Producing class in California history." It is through his coöperation with the *Grizzly bear* that one phase of producing work has been greatly stimulated: a new spirit imbues the student who hopes that his term paper may be among those deemed of sufficient import for publication in the *Grizzly bear*.

It is not at all apparent why Jacob Van der Zee should, in the March, 1918, issue of *Iowa and war* present an interpretation of "The Black Hawk war" formulated upon material which the sympathetic historian would cull out. The use of such phrases as "the Indian's ceaseless desire to murder"; the incorporation of the statement — which no available evidence covers — that Black Hawk in 1832 brought his band "back to the village site of their fathers to raise their corn"; and the markedly inadequate treatment of Stillman's defeat — make one wonder whether this method of depicting an event can be covered by the canons of sound historical criticism.

The Loubat prizes for the best works on the history, geography, ar-

chaeology, ethnology, philology, or numismatics of North America, which have been printed and published in the English language for the five year period since January 1, 1913, have been awarded by resolution of the trustees of Columbia university as follows:

The first prize of $1,000 to Clarence Walworth Alvord, Ph. D., professor of history in the university of Illinois, for his work entitled *The Mississippi valley in British politics: a study of the trade, land speculation, and experiments in imperialism culminating in the American revolution*, 2 volumes, 1916.

The second prize of $400 to Herbert Ingram Priestly, Ph.D., assistant professor of history in the university of California, for his work entitled *José de Gálvez, visitor-general of New Spain, 1767-1771.* 1 volume, 1916.

In the April, 1917, *Journal of the Illinois state historical society* Judson Fiske Lee presents a large mass of badly organized material under the title "Transportation — a factor in the development of northern Illinois previous to 1860."

Archibald Henderson has utilized Spanish manuscript and archive material in order to build up a comprehensive view of a hitherto neglected phase of state history; his "Spanish conspiracy in Tennessee" appears in the December, 1917 *Tennessee historical magazine*; in the same number is a third selection from the rich collection of the Donelson papers. The letters, running from 1846-1856, have been selected for their general political interest or their relation to the career of Andrew J. Donelson.

Chauncey Samuel Boucher publishes "The secession and coöperation movements in South Carolina, 1848 to 1852" as the April, 1918 *Washington university studies*; manuscript, and in particular, newspaper material have been drawn on largely in the preparation of this excellent monograph.

In the March, 1918 *Indiana magazine of history* J. Edward Murr continues in the same local colorful strain "Lincoln in Indiana," and Elmore Barce contributes "Topenbee and the decline of the Pottawattomie nation."

The state historical society of Iowa, has issued a bulletin which purposes to point out to public libraries, local historical societies, and local historians of Iowa, the important patriotic service connected with the *Collection and preservation of the materials of war history.*

Among the contributions of the *American economic review* for March, 1918, are Carl C. Plehm's "State market commission of California," and William M. Duffus' "Government control of the wheat trade in the

United States," the "supplement" to the same number publishes the papers and proceedings of the thirtieth annual meeting of the American economic association.

Earl S. Fullbrook in the *Iowa journal of history and politics* for April, 1918, most interestingly develops "Relief work in Iowa during the civil war," a sketch of which he recently published in *Iowa and war.*

The *Political science quarterly* for March, 1918, contains Edwin R. A. Seligman's "The war revenue act," Edward Krehbiel's "European commission of the Danube," Ordway Tead's "British reconstruction programs," and Robert Livingston Schuyler's "Abolition of British imperial preference, 1846-1860."

The *Military historian and economist* for April, 1918, prints as a supplement with separate pagination, the first installment of a confidential memorandum, issued by the German general staff on, "The railroad concentration for the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71." Although the document refers to conditions fifty years ago, the fundamental principles then laid down hold good now; they offer an excellent starting point for solving the complex problems of today. Among the contributions in the same number Paul Azan discusses "The historical section in a general staff," T. N. Carver presents the question "Are we in danger of becoming Prussianized," and Victor S. Clark, in the space of eight pages, lightly disposes of "Manufacturing development during the civil war."

In number two, of volume five of the university of Iowa monographs, Paul S. Peirce by summarizing the "Social surveys of three rural townships in Iowa," puts into accessible form information concerning country life in southeastern Iowa.

In order that the causal geographic factor in history might be systematically incorporated in history study in high schools, H. A. Bone, of Sioux City, Iowa, has written the laboratory manual *Geographic factors in American history* to accompany the study of United States history. In it he outlines thirty-seven "problems" covering the principal movements in the development of the United States; each problem — in giving historical references, topics for study and recitation, note book work, things to do, and things to think about — strives to lead the student to independent thinking.

In the May, 1918, *Bulletin of the Illinois council of geography teachers* Douglas C. Ridgley presents "The home state as a unit of geographic study," using the state of Illinois to illustrate the factors in such a study.

Victor Hugo Paltsits, keeper of manuscripts in the New York public library has selected and published in pamphlet form five representative letters from the collection of one hundred seventy-two *Letters of American clergymen, 1711 to 1860* recently presented the New York public library by Simon Gratz. Although the subject matter of the letters is generally ecclesiastical, important public matters and early American education also receive generous attention in them.

John M. Cooper's *Analytical and critical bibliography of the tribes of Fierra del Fuego and adjacent territory* is published as Bulletin 63, Smithsonian institution, bureau of American ethnology.

An account of "Missouri's first centennial day," Columbia, Missouri, January 8, 1918, and a tribute to the librarian and bibliographer, Francis Asbury Sampson, 1842-1918, by Floyd C. Shoemaker, appear in the April, 1918, *Missouri historical review.*

Edward A. Miller's monograph "The history of educational legislation in Ohio" and its elaborate index comprise the January and April issues of the *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly.*

The Minnesota history bulletin for February, 1918, prints a memorial "James J. Hill," by Joseph G. Pyle and "The organization of the volunteer army in 1861 with special reference to Minnesota," by John D. Hicks.

Three years ago the growing need of students in the Hispanic-American field for a periodical devoted to the southern countries of the Americas became acutely recognized, and plans for a newcomer among special historical publications were set on foot. The project — which Woodrow Wilson feels "ought to lead to very important results both for scholarship and for the increase of cordial feeling throughout the Americas," — fruited in *The Hispanic American historical review*, appearing for the first time in February, 1918. It is a dignified journal of over a hundred pages and is to be published quarterly by its board of editors; James A. Robertson is managing editor and with him are associated Charles E. Chapman, Isaac J. Cox, Julius J. Klein, William R. Manning, and William Spence Robertson. To this first number Charles H. Cunningham contributes "The institutional background of Spanish-American history," Charles W. Hackett, "The delimitation of political jurisdictions in Spanish North America to 1535," and William Spence Robertson, "The recognition of the Spanish colonies by the motherland."

NEW HISTORY MAPS

With Teachers' Manuals

Designed by Educators Edited by Scholars Produced by Craftsmen

Uniform large size, 44x32 inches. In colors. Cloth-backed

AMERICAN HISTORY

23 maps. Edited by Prof. Albert B. Hart of Harvard University and Prof. Herbert E. Bolton of University of California

EUROPEAN HISTORY

23 maps. Edited by Prof. Samual B. Harding of Indiana University

ANCIENT HISTORY

16 maps. Edited by Profs. James H. Breasted and Carl F. Huth, Jr., of the University of Chicago

FOR ADDITIONAL DETAILS WRITE

DENOYER-GEPPERT CO.

AMERICA'S LEADING SCHOOL MAP PUBLISHERS

460 EAST OHIO ST. CHICAGO

The Formation of the State of Oklahoma, 1803-1906

(University of California Publications In History, Vol. VI)

By Roy Gittinger, Professor of History in the University of Oklahoma

A most interesting and well written history of the development of practically the whole southwestern part of the country. — *Springfield Republican.*

The admission of Oklahoma in 1906 brought to a close the formation of states from the Louisiana Purchase. Dr. Gittinger writes of the events, mainly connected with our national Indian policy, which withheld the area from statehood for a much longer period than the rest of the acquisition. It is a story of the stoppage of the westward movement and of its reopening under pressure from the landgrant railroad and the settler. The barrier removed, the population rose in fifteen years from a few thousand to a million and a half. This scholarly work is based on documentary sources, is well written, and intensely interesting.

268 pages, cloth, $2.00, carriage extra

The University of California Press

Berkley, California 280 Madison Avenue, N. Y.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. V, NO. 2 SEPTEMBER, 1918

THE FIRST RAILROAD BETWEEN THE MISSISSIPPI AND LAKE SUPERIOR[1]

One of the economic by-products of the civil war was a determined effort to link the navigable waters of the Mississippi river with the head of Lake Superior. Such a connection had been projected before the war, and it would have come eventually under any circumstances, but it was indubitably emphasized and very probably hurried on by the abnormal conditions accompanying the war between the states.

Two chief considerations impressed upon people the absolute necessity to them of the link: there was the rapidly growing market for food products and lumber on the upper peninsula, where the mines had been stirred anew; and, the increased crops of the upper Mississippi valley, coupled with exorbitant freight charges, impelled to a search for a cheaper route to the Atlantic coast and to Europe.

The iron and copper mines of the Lake Superior region, which for years had struggled under not too promising conditions,[2] found that the war, instead of snuffing them out as had been feared, created a demand for their ore beyond wildest dreams. Hamlets blossomed into thriving towns; labor trebled its wages and was sought by special agents, even in Europe.[3] But while ore was plentiful and prices good, food and other necessities were scarce and dear. Practically everything consumed came from Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, or even from some place still farther away; wheat, raised in the Minnesota valley, traveled by water and rail five hundred miles to Chicago, and thence, in the form of flour, through Lakes Michigan and Superior to Ontonagon; flour, beef, hay, grain of all sorts, and produce were

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Paul, May 10, 1918.

[2] Peter White, "Iron region of Lake Superior," in *Michigan pioneer and historical collections*, 8: 145-161; John H. Forster, "Lake Superior country," in *ibid.*, 8: 136-145.

[3] *Ibid.*, 8: 142.

brought even from Ohio, a thousand miles away, and the rates were correspondingly high.[4] These commodities, as well as lumber — used in ever increasing quantites — could be obtained in Minnesota or Wisconsin if only there were the necessary facilities for transportation. On the other hand, western Wisconsin, and central and southern Minnesota needed a market for those products which could not be shipped economically to any great distance. Legitimate self-interest, then, both at Lake Superior and along the Minnesota, the St. Croix, and the upper reaches of the Mississippi, demanded a linking of supply and demand.

Again, the steadily increasing crops of wheat and other grains,[5] which could find a market in the east and in Europe, were obliged to make use of water transportation in order to reach the railroads to convey them to Milwaukee and Chicago. The northernmost point on the Mississippi touched by a railhead was La Crosse; here the Milwaukee and St. Paul had reached its most western extension. Throughout the war, then, the only route over which the Minnesota or western Wisconsin farmer could ship his grain, or the merchant import his wares, was made up of the inadequate roads to the Mississippi or one of its navigable branches, and a single railroad connecting the river with Lake Michigan. Iowa was served by roads which reached the river at Prairie du Chien, and at several places farther south on the Illinois bank.

The commanding position occupied by the Milwaukee and St. Paul and its southern competitors, was apparent to the directors of those lines, and controlling or acting in conjunction with the river steamers, they did not scruple to charge the traffic all it would bear. Between 1862 and 1864 the rate on grain from Minnesota points to Chicago and Milwaukee doubled.[6] During

[4] J. L. Ritchie, in *Ontonagon Miner*, quoted in *St. Paul Daily Press*, December 19, 1861. It cost $8.00 a head to send cattle from Detroit or Chicago to Ontonagon. "R" (Ritchie without doubt) in a letter to the *St. Paul Daily Press*, August 5, 1862, written from Superior, said that in the season of four months in 1860 Detroit alone sent to the mining towns 2257 head of cattle, 423 hogs, 552 sheep, 329,324 pounds of butter, 22,947 barrels of flour, 107,828 bushels of oats and other grains.

[5] Minnesota's production of wheat was 5,101,432 bushels in 1860; 3,800,000 bushels in 1861; and 9,475,000 bushels in 1865. See "Statistics of Minnesota," in *Minnesota executive documents, 1869*, 792.

[6] "The Railroads and Steamboat companies between St. Paul, Chicago and

the season of 1864, agents of the railroads, acting with representatives of the steamboat lines, met at Chicago and advanced the rate again by from three to eleven cents per bushel, varying with the distance from the railhead; other commodities had their rates raised correspondingly.[7] For the season of 1865 the rate on wheat ran from ten cents (at Winona) to fifteen cents (at St. Paul) for water carriage, while the rail charge to Milwaukee, Racine or Chicago was twenty cents per bushel. Such a charge as this, it was estimated, would reduce the return to the Minnesota farmer to less than forty cents a bushel, a price at which it would not pay to ship the grain.[8]

Direct rail connection between the head of naviation of the Mississippi, at St. Paul, and the western end of Lake Superior had long been under consideration. Such a project[9] had been included in the comprehensive scheme of railroads contemplated in the land grants for Minnesota territory in 1854, but owing to some interference with the bill, in going from the house to the senate, the measure was repealed shortly after its passage.[10] In 1857 the Minnesota legislature had made a grant of swamp lands to the Nebraska and Lake Superior railroad company, a name which, by an act of March 8, 1861, was changed to the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad company.[11] Wisconsin, in 1856, had also received a grant of land for a

Milwaukie have entered into a combination to increase the rates of freight on wheat and merchandise between these points, nearly 100 per cent over former rates. — This swindling combination has justly excited the indignation of the merchants, shippers and farmers of Minnesota.'' *Faribault Central Republican,* March 2, 1864. *Chatfield Democrat,* February 27, 1864, expressed similar sentiments.

[7] *St. Paul Daily Press,* June 30, 1864. Previously the rate from St. Paul had been 25 cents per bushel; it was now 36 cents. At Winona the rate rose from 25 to 28 cents. The rail rate from La Crosse or Prairie Du Chien to the lake was 38 cents per 110 pounds.

[8] *Ibid.,* March 29, 1865. Flour was 35 to 60 cents per barrel for water transportation, and the rail tariff was 65 cents.

[9] *Statutes at large of the United States,* 10: 302. Lands for a road from the southern boundary of Minnesota to Lake Superior via St. Paul.

[10] Verbal changes making a difference in its meaning occurred after its passage by the house and before it reached the senate. Its repeal is found in a rider to a private pension bill. *Ibid.,* 10: 575; *Congressional globe,* 23 congress, 3 session, 2100-2103, 2172-2178.

[11] ''Report of the railroad commissioner, 1872,'' in *Minnesota executive documents, 1872,* 142.

road from Hudson on the St. Croix river to Lake Superior.[12] Neither project, however, had gone much beyond the initial stage of forming a company, since, among other things, all railroad building had been ended for the time by the panic of 1857 and the subsequent financial depression throughout the country. So long as the lower Mississippi was open to the products of the northwest the matter did not press, but with that highway closed by the war well might Senator Ramsey voice the demand of his constituents for another exit:[13]

"This is a matter of vital importance to us in Minnesota. We have now a surplus of wheat for transportation to the east rising three million bushels annually. The roads that carry off this wheat for us through Wisconsin, down the Mississippi River and through Illinois have not sufficient transportation, and they have increased the transit between St. Paul and Milwaukie to Chicago from 12½ cents in 1862 to 25 cents in this year (1864). This is an oppression that our agriculture cannot endure. We are the furthest inland State of the northwestern tier of States. Surely it is of importance to the Government to give us the readiest facilities of getting to market with that large surplus of wheat without compelling us to pass through Wisconsin and Illinois."

An additional reason for furthering a road which would tap the ore regions appeared to exist in the possibility, as it appeared in the winter of 1861-1862, that hostilities might occur between the United States and Great Britain, with the probable closing of the Soo canal.[14]

Among the incidental advantages which might be derived from a road to the lake were the opening of lands in a timbered region, the consequent flow of money into the treasury of the United States, and a greater flood of immigrants to take up such agricultural lands as might be made available for settlement. It was not forgotten that the vicinity of the falls of St. Anthony might utilize the northern ore in becoming a manufacturing center; indeed there were rosy hopes of the time when

[12] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, part 1, 923, where Ramsey summarizes the legislative situation with respect to the grants.

[13] *Ibid.*, 38 congress, 1 session, part 1, 924.

[14] Richard Chute in *St. Paul Daily Press*, April 12, 1862.

factories of St. Anthony and Minneapolis should fabricate the greater portion of the machinery and the agricultural and domestic implements which were demanded in ever increasing quantities in Minnesota, Iowa, Dakota territory, and even in the boundless Saskatchewan country.[15]

Such being the situation it is not surprising that, as the war went on, the demand for relief became more and more insistent. But the case was not simple. Although St. Paul might urge that her position at the head of navigation entitled her to first consideration, there was more than a little jealousy within the state and much hostility outside. Furthermore, rival interests in townsites on the part of citizens of St. Paul made it impossible to secure united effort for either Bayfield or Superior in Wisconsin (the alternative termini of the Wisconsin road), or for Duluth in Minnesota, the proposed northern terminus of the Minnesota line. If the road should be put through from Hudson, not only would it lie wholly within the state of Wisconsin, but it would forward the prospects of those who had become heavily involved in land speculation at one or both of the Wisconsin towns. On the other hand, should the road run directly from St. Paul by the shortest line to the lake, it would be entirely within the bounds of Minnesota, and would without doubt cause the building of the St. Croix line to be postponed indefinitely. Again, such a project would possibly advance the interests of St. Paul at the expense of its bitter rivals, St. Anthony and Minneapolis, and at the same time arouse the jealousy of places farther up the Mississippi where there were dreams of future greatness.

But circumstances conspired during 1862 and 1863 not

[15] Letter from "T. C." dated Lake Superior, April, 1862, in *St. Paul Daily Press*, April 13, 1862. This was undoubtedly Thomas Clark, a civil engineer who later surveyed the line from Superior to St. Cloud for the Northern Pacific. Mr. Clark was probably as well acquainted with the region as anyone in the northwest. For a characterization of him see John R. Carey, "History of Duluth, and of St. Louis county, to the year 1870," in *Minnesota historical society collections*, 10:251. In a letter in the *St. Paul Daily Press*, May 8, 1862, Mr. Clark dwelt at length on the superior quality of the iron ore of the upper peninsula, and the possibilities of reducing it on the ground, thus providing raw material for future rolling mills, foundries and the like at the Falls of St. Anthony. Chicago, he maintained, had already seen the opportunity, and the Chicago and Northwestern railroad was already framing plans to grasp the golden moment.

only to emphasize the advantage of a line to the lake, but to point out that it was within the realm of possibility that the prize might be snatched by another from the city which could present so many arguments for its possession. In July, 1862, congress passed a resolution providing that a branch of the St. Paul and Pacific railroad should run from some point between the Falls of St. Anthony and Crow Wing to the head of Lake Superior.[16] The first section of the main line of this road, ten miles in length, had just been completed and the first train run over its rails about a week before[17] while grading on the second unit, to Anoka, was proceeding with commendable celerity. This road, therefore, might be in a position to delay action for a line tapping the same general region until the country should have become much more settled. In addition to all this, direct rail communication between Chicago and the upper peninsula was coming nearer every day. Should such a connection be established it would seriously endanger the prospects which Minnesota might entertain of obtaining a foothold in the markets of that prosperous district.[18]

One of the principal champions of the projected Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad was J. A. Wheelock, editor of the *St. Paul Daily Press;* his paper, consequently, became the medium for spreading the propaganda. As the leading republican newspaper of the state, with a circulation of some proportions in Wisconsin and Iowa, it was in a position to reach a large and influential group of readers. During the earlier portion of the war it had given some attention to the subject, but by the summer and autumn of 1863 it had taken up the campaign for a federal grant of land in aid of the project in good earnest. All arguments in favor of the scheme were set forth in

[16] *St. Paul Daily Press,* July 11, 1862.

[17] The first train was run from St. Paul to St. Anthony June 28, 1862. *Ibid.,* June 29, 1862.

[18] "J. S. R." wrote from Superior that an "influential merchant" wrote from Chicago that bonds were being sold to finance a road across the peninsula from Bay de Noquet to Marquette, while the Northwestern road had engaged to connect with this line at an early date. The charter of the new road has been obtained with a grant of 5000 acres of land to the mile, and there were prospects of its being completed within two years. *Ibid.,* April 14, 1863.

their most persuasive form:[19] Duluth's harbor, better than that at Superior or Bayfield, was emphasized; the distance of 140 miles from St. Paul to the lake was shorter than that of any other proposed route (the completed line was actually 155 miles long); natural resources of the country through which the line would pass would render construction cheap as well as induce rapid settlement; all Minnesota would benefit from the presence of the commercial towns which would spring into existence as soon as a railroad should be built to create them.

The city council of St. Paul put itself behind the proposition by bringing forward a plan to bond the city in order to grant to the railroad company a bonus of $500,000.[20] Sober second thought made the people of this ambitious, but still small and pioneer town, realize that such a sum would seriously burden them, hence the amount was halved, and the ordinance passed, only to be vetoed by the mayor.[21] It was carried over his objection, however, and then submitted to the electorate for approval.[22] By a light vote the measure was ratified[23] and the legislature, during the following session, gave the necessary legal sanction to the proceeding.[24]

With a grant of swamp lands from the state and a bonus from the city of St. Paul, the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad company might well feel itself fortified to go before congress with an appeal for a grant of federal lands which, it was felt, was the only further encouragement necessary to draw forth capital to build the road. The advocates of the proposal were further strengthened by a memorial from the

[19] In addition to printing numerous letters, excerpts, editorials, and the like, the *St. Paul Daily Press,* in January, 1864, while the land grant measure was pending in congress, ran a series of leading articles by "North Shore" covering the whole question. *Ibid.,* January 19, 21, 22, 23, 27, 1864.

[20] *Ibid.,* November 5, 1863.

[21] *Ibid.,* November 21, 1863. The ordinance was passed by a vote of 10 to 4. It proposed to issue bonds to the amount of $250,000, maturing in 20, 25 and 30 years, bearing six per cent interest, the proceeds to be donated to the railroad company provided it completed the road in five years and had graded twenty miles within two years.

[22] *Ibid.,* December 2, 1863.

[23] *Ibid.,* December 16, 1863. The vote was 660 in favor of the issue, 255 against. In the state election in November, 1863, 2083 votes had been cast.

[24] *General and special laws of Minnesota, 1864,* 309-312.

city council of St. Paul,[25] and one from the state legislature of Minnesota.[26]

Opposition in Minnesota, which had been simmering while the project was still in a nebulous state, gathered and broke out in various places when it appeared that a genuine movement was under way. All through the winter of 1863-1864, when congress had the question of a land grant under consideration, influence was brought to bear to discourage and discredit the entire proposal. "By the time the bona fide capitalists are found ready to invest 4/5 million dollars to build a direct line of road from St. Paul to Lake Superior through a country two-thirds if not three-fourths of the distance so poor that a Chippewa Indian can't live on it—simply to make St. Paul a terminus or prevent the trade and travel from Lake Superior passing through any other town on its way to St. Paul there will be plenty of roads in all other parts of the state."[27] So wrote Orville Brown, editor of the *Faribault Central Republican*, who not infrequently dipped his pen in vitriol. The whole line was a humbug, quoth he[28], "got up or sought to be got up for the benefit of a few speculators excessively anxious to become railroad kings or land monopolists at public expense, and Alexander Ramsey has just the capacity necessary to represent that class of political demagogue speculators in the United States Senate.

According to a correspondent in a St. Cloud paper, "Narrow minded political economists of St. Paul have nearly crazed

[25] To accompany the memorial William P. Murray wrote a long letter to the members of the Minnesota delegation in congress dwelling at great length upon the points which might be urged in favor of the scheme. Murray to Donnelly, December 21, 1863, Donnelly papers, in the library of the Minnesota historical society, St. Paul.

[26] A letter from R. J. Baldwin to Donnelly, March 3, 1864, indicates that the unanimity with which the legislative memorial was passed was more apparent than real. "What you say in your favor of the 16th all in reference to the votes of the Representatives of this Co. [Hennepin] in the Legislature, I must acknowledge the force of, and perhaps I ought not to ask you to believe that the sentiments of the people of the Co. do not correspond with the vote of their Representatives. This much however I will say, that had I been in the Legislature the Memorial for a land grant to the Lake Sup & Miss R R Co. would have received one less vote than it did receive." Donnelly papers.

[27] *Faribault Central Republican*, December 23, 1863.

[28] *Ibid.*, December 30, 1863.

themselves in efforts to study up a railroad system that shall aggrandize that city at the expense of the rest of the State. There is hardly a man in the State who realizes that we have a *State* 400 miles long and 200 miles wide to be developed. They are all absorbed in St. Paul with a radiation of about 20 miles each way; there are a few noble exceptions.''[29]

It was, however, in Hennepin county, at St. Anthony and Minneapolis, that the most fervent although not the most violent or outspoken opposition was to be found in the state. With the terminus at St. Paul the two neighboring communities felt that they would of necessity be cut off from the main line, which was to penetrate a potentially important portion of the state. To be way stations on a road to the lake ill suited these ambitious towns.[30]

In general the southern portion of the state, which contained the bulk of the population outside Hennepin and Ramsey counties, joined heartily with the dominant element of the capital city in favor of the road. It was characterized as ''one of the wisest measures'' and one calculated to do justice to every section, especially when it was linked with a scheme to push south to Sioux City, Iowa.[31]

While the opposition within the state took the form of local jealousy and strife for precedence, far more vigorous and men-

[29] ''Idaho,'' in *St. Cloud Democrat,* January 28, 1864. According to this individual the real centers of trade, consequently of railroads, of Minnesota were St. Cloud, Kandiyohi, St. Peter, and Owatonna. St. Cloud, for instance, ''will inevitably be a point at which roads will center from St. Peter, Superior, and British possessions and Kandiyohi, representing the immense agricultural region west of the Big Woods.'' ''These things are *inevitable* and St. Paul must learn to take her chance for immortality and greatness with the development of the State, and not with special reference to making a *top* of the State, that St. Paul may be the spindle.''

[30] *St. Paul Daily Press,* April 27, 1864.

[31] *Mower County Register,* April 14, 1864. *Mankato Record,* January 1, 1864, quoted in *St. Paul Daily Press,* January 13, 1864, saw in the proposed Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad a distinct advantage for the Blue Earth people. The proposed road would give ''a direct eastern outlet via St. Paul and Lake Superior, and the cost of exportation will, on the same quantities [of grain] and at the same rate, be reduced to $168,000 — a saving annually to Blue Earth county of $137,000'' over the cost of the existing route via St. Paul, the Mississippi, and rail to Lake Michigan. In his message to the legislature, December, 1863, Governor Swift referred to the very great advantages to be derived from the proposed road. *St. Paul Daily Press,* January 11, 1864.

acing was the hostility of the Wisconsin roads which had no desire to see a considerable portion of their traffic diverted from Lake Michigan to Lake Superior over the rails of a road which must enter into competition with their hitherto uncontested monopoly. While some attention was directed to sowing seeds of dissension in Minnesota, even in St. Paul itself,[32] their principal efforts were aimed at the real source of power, congress, which could give or withhold the grant of lands.

A bill, introduced in the senate early in the session of 1863-1864, had been referred to the committee on public lands, whence it had been favorably reported; in March, 1864, Senator Ramsey succeeded in getting the measure before the senate.[33] The senior senator from Wisconsin, James R. Doolittle, sought to delay consideration and to have the bill referred back so that the committee might investigate the complaints which had been pouring in. While professing to be in full sympathy with the general idea, Doolittle maintained that there was no need for congress to make another grant of land, since, in 1856, there had been granted lands in support of a railroad project over nearly the same route; that is, from the St. Croix river to Bayfield or Superior on the lake. The company formed to build this line had made surveys and had actually started work, but the panic of 1857 and then the war had prevented active prosecution of the road.

Such a statement as this led up to the real issue. If the Hudson-Superior-Bayfield project was to be pushed, and even though the two lines, according to the proposed routes, might be sixty miles apart at one place, it would appear that congress could ill afford to encourage the starting of a rival with termini at practically the same points, for Hudson was but fifteen or sixteen miles from St. Paul. In the unsettled condition of the country it was patent to all that both roads could not se-

[32] When the friends of the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroads were trying to work up public enthusiasm by popular meetings, especially before the bonus election, the backers of the Hudson road were at work in the city trying to stir up opposition, even going so far as to bring the president of the St. Croix and Superior company to St. Paul to exert his influence. *Ibid.*, December 12, 1863. In the meantime the Hudson people were exerting themselves to arouse local support of their road.

[33] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, part 1, 923.

cure the capital necessary to carry them to completion, and that starting two roads meant the defeat of both. If the older scheme were to be forwarded in good faith, and if a considerable sum had already been expended on the preliminary work, it was manifestly unfair to wreck the whole undertaking by giving an impetus to the line from St. Paul to Duluth.

It was a question, however, as to whether the backers of the St. Croix line seriously intended to build or merely make a pretense of so doing in order to check congressional action, and thus prevent the construction of any road to compete with the lines to Chicago and Milwaukee. Senator Wilkinson spoke the feeling of many of his Minnesota constituents when he said:[34] "I admit that what the Senator from Wisconsin has said in regard to the Senators from his State is true. I believe that these gentlemen, as a general rule, have favored measures tending to the advancement of the State of Minnesota; but why do they oppose this proposition? Is it because some men out of Wisconsin are or pretend to be interested in a railroad charter from Hudson to Lake Superior? I understand that those men represent capital in New York and Philadelphia, and other eastern cities. I do not understand that they are Wisconsin gentlemen. I understand that they are down here now lobbying with Congress to defeat this bill; and why? Merely because one railroad corporation is to be slightly affected by it."

That the real basis of the sudden activity of the St. Croix people was due to covert influence of the great Wisconsin railroads was a common impression. Thomas Clark, writing to Ignatius Donnelly after he had read the statements of the Wisconsin senators in opposition to the grant, adds the testimony of one long familiar with the whole region and the various projects which had sprung up there:[35]

"I see in a Madison, Wis., paper a report of Senator Doolittle's debate with Senator Ramsey on the 'land grant.' Senator D. says that the Min. route will cost $700,000 more than the Wis.; that the latter is less in distance, the St. C. Company have their road under contract, they will build a

[34] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, part 1, 967.

[35] Donnelly papers, March 29, 1864.

rolling mill at Superior to work the ore bed 15 miles from that place, that the Company was delayed by the crisis of 1857 and the war.

"I am well acquainted with both routes, a better route can be found than either by ignoring the State line;—but the Minnesota route will not cost much if any more than the Wisconsin route; as the latter is now laid down in the land office map a copy of which I have, it is quite as long as the Min, route—140 miles. The St. Croix Co. have about 40 miles under contract; if any work is done, it is in the line *toward* Bayfield. There has no ore bed been discovered within 15 or 50 miles of this place (Superior) there is a rich ore bed back of Duluth in Minnesota, and another about 15 or 20 miles east of Ashland in Wisconsin. The latter place is at the head of the large bay south of the Islands some 20 miles from Bayfield, the railroad men have misled Senator D. in this iron ore bed matter. No one of the present St. Croix Co's. managers has ever been here much less made arrangements to build a rolling mill. The St. Croix Co put their road under contract in 1856 the contractors were Dillon Jackman Jarett & Co. of N.J. and Pa. These contractors expended some $10,000 or $12,000. In the winter of 1856-7 Kilbourn got control of much of the Wisconsin land grant the St. Croix and Superior included; then as now the La Cross Co. knew that a short road of 136 miles would ruin their 212—so Kilbourn bought off Dillon Jackman Jarett & Co. and stopped the work—long before the crisis of 1857 came on; again on this as well as on the iron subject Senator D. was misled.

"The truth is the Lake Michigan and Mississippi railway managers will fight the Superior road to *the bitter end*—they know perfectly well that if we get a road of 140 miles it will draw one half of Minnesota's tonnage and compel them to nurse the other half at a greatly reduced tariff. It is this interest which stirs up our Superior people to fight your Minnesota road, the latter killed, they will then as before let the Superior interest *slide,* and go on with a *long* route, if any."[36]

[36] In the same letter Mr. Clark indicates that he has information from authoritative sources that the interests fighting the St. Paul road were really backing a scheme to build from Hudson to Bayfield rather than to Superior; it is to this

Members of the senate committee on public lands were of the opinion that there was no new information to come before them, and in their opinion there was no good purpose served in delaying the bill. Not only these senators but many of their colleagues looked upon the opposition of the Wisconsin senators as captious; it did not appear on the surface that Wisconsin was to be injured by the proposed grant, while Minnesota would be benefited without question.[37] Furthermore, Senator Hendricks of Indiana confessed that while he had in committee and on the floor supported the St. Paul project, he had done so reluctantly, and only because he had no faith in the construction, in the near future, of the road to Superior or Bayfield.[38] Hendrick's words carried the more weight since he had been commissioner of the public land office when the earlier grants had been made. It was in vain, then, that the Wisconsin senators labored to block the measure, and the bill was passed on the tenth of March, 1864.

In the house, proceedings appeared to be of the most formal nature. Two amendments were made to the senate measure by the house committee on public lands: the grantee was to be the state of Minnesota rather than the railroad company, and the words "from some point south of St. Louis River to some point on Lake Superior" were substituted for those by which the senate had specifically fixed the termini.[39] The house accepted both amendments and approved the bill with neither debate nor division. In the senate the second amendment was dropped, certain verbal changes made, and the house accepted the amendments. It received the signature of the president on the fifth of May.

that he refers when speaking of the "long route." The *St. Paul Daily Press* quotes an article from the *Lake Superior Gazette*, April 9, 1864, giving essentially the same information. Mr. Clark's hand appears in this, for, as he wrote Donnelly March 29, 1864, "to keep myself from idleness this winter I engaged to edit the little sheet we have sent you," i.e., the *Gazette*. Mr. Clark admitted that he was interested "both in prejudice and money in the St. Paul and Lake Co."

[37] Reverdy Johnson (Md.), who had had a professional interest in the original land grant bill and the charter for this road, maintained that the Wisconsin senators took narrow ground in their opposition.

[38] Hendricks held that the route which made Superior or, even better, Bayfield the northern terminus was preferable on account of the better harbor and longer open season.

[39] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, part 2, 1030, 1887.

The act granted "to the State of Minnesota for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroad from the city of St. Paul to the head of Lake Superior, every alternate section of public land of the United States, not mineral, designated by odd numbers, to the amount of five alternate sections per mile on each side of the said railroad."[40] The usual restriction was added, that the road was to be completed within eight years, otherwise the lands were to revert to the government. On the day the president signed this act he approved a bill which increased the land grant in aid of the St. Croix and Superior railroad in such a manner as to make its endowment of lands equivalent to the gift to the Lake Superior and Mississippi road.[41]

If surface indications made it appear that the interest in the house was purely formal, there are other evidences that the same forces, which had been at work both for and against the measure in the senate, had been as active with members of the house, and especially with Ignatius Donnelly, representative from the second district of Minnesota. Donnelly was bombarded with letters and telegrams in the same manner as his colleagues in the senate had been, and during the whole period the two factions had maintained an active lobby at work at the national capital. William P. Murray and W. L. Banning represented the friends of the Lake Superior and Mississippi, and these two gentlemen had no hesitation in letting it be known for what purpose they were in Washington. They did not neglect any rope that would help, and there were various interests which could be manipulated in their favor, as is indicated when, in March, Jas. S. Ritchie wrote Donnelly from Superior:

"I write by this mail to urge my old acquaintances in the Phila. delegation to aid you in getting the St. Paul Land Grant.

"Hon. Jno. L. Dawson one of our largest Tax Payers is now in Congress, and of *course* he will do all he can to get the Penna. Delegation to go in for it.

[40] *Statutes at large of the United States,* 13: 64.

[41] *Ibid.,* 13: 66-68. When the news of the proposed grant to the Wisconsin roads (a road from Tomah to Hudson had a similar grant) the *St. Paul Daily Press,* April 4, 1864, expressed its opinion that this was just another of the ingenious dodges of the Wisconsin roads, so often used to strangle a rival company.

"We told Mr. Lovejoy when here last summer how the Wisonsin Co. had treated us, and also that it was our unanimous wish to be annexed to Minnesota.

"I must caution you against one Genl. L. E. Webb, Indian agent who doubtless is lobbying for Bayfield R Road.

"I trust Hon. J. L. Dawson will use all his influence to aid the St. Paul Land Grant. Please hand this note to him. The Kentucky Tax Payers and they own a large interest here request this by their representation here."[42]

Both Banning and Murray were openly introduced as being in Washington in the interest of the St. Paul land grant.[43] The opponents of the Minnesota road were less outspoken although little less pertinacious in their efforts. Whether the opposition came from rival interests in Minnesota or from the railroads of Wisconsin the tone was much the same; there was the air of throwing cold water upon the scheme, while not venturing to condemn it absolutely. Perhaps a typical illustration is to be found in a warning from Henry Fletcher, United States land agent at Minneapolis, to Congressman Donnelly:[44]

"Our friends at St. Paul are raising every influence which can be made to bear on the subject to influence congressional

[42] March 21, 1864. The letter is found among the Murray papers, in the possession of the Minnesota historical society.

[43] J. M. Gilman of St. Paul gave Murray a letter of introduction to Hon. A. Long. He says, "He is sent to Washington by our city authorities to look after our land grant bill." Banning was introduced in a similar manner; see E. F. Drake to S. S. Cox. Both letters are in the Murray papers.

[44] Fletcher to Donnelly, Minneapolis, March 18, 1864, Donnelly papers. R. J. Baldwin also wrote from Minneapolis in much the same strain. He took occasion to cast doubts upon the financial soundness of the backers of the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad company. Baldwin to Donnelly, January 25 and March 3, 1864, *ibid.*

An interesting letter from ex-Senator Rice of Minnesota, written from New York, April 20, 1864, is found among the Murray papers. Rice says: "I have had an interview with Col Berthoud, President of the St. Croix and Lake Superior Rail Road, also with Hon. E. March Prest of the Morris Canal and Banking Co., Jersey City, who is one of the trustees of said road and one of the largest stockholders, both say positively that Mr. Baldwin who has been opposing the road from St. Paul to Superior acted without authority from the St. Croix and Superior R. R. Co., and that they are not opposed to the grant asked for by Hon. W. Banning and others, but think their road should receive additional aid." In this lies a hint of the compromise which was arranged, noted above, whereby the St. Croix opposition was relaxed when it was agreed to increase the grants to that road at the same time the grant was made to the St. Paul road.

land grant aid to a line located between St. Paul and Superior. To this project if it was feasible we should not object as a connection by rail with Lake Superior is considered by us all as a matter of the first importance. But in building a road to that point we are met in the start with the damaging fact that if the road was built, for seven months in the year, it would have no outlet for its business and consequently would have to depend on a five months business to support their road.

"The line from St. Paul runs over the worst country for Railroad building that there is to be found on this continent—the worst grading, the most marshy ground so that the line would cost double the amount required to build a line of road either from Anoka or St. Cloud. With Superior closed for seven months if we expect capitalists to build a road for us we must of course extend our aid to the shortest and cheapest route or allow them to select both the road and the termini.

"Moreover it is a well established fact that Rail Road companies depend largely for their business on way business. The country traversed by the St. Paul line confessedly is the most barren of agricultural inducements for settlement of any like tract in the whole west. A line may be selected higher up the river which will pass through a region capable of sustaining a very considerable agricultural population. These considerations induce me earnestly to recommend that the company be allowed to select their own route and the points at which it will strike both the Mississippi and Lake Superior.

"I do not blame our St. Paul friends for their anxiety to tie the company to the interests of St. Paul but in my opinion if that policy prevails it destroys effectually our chances for a Rail Road to Superior for some time to come & it is a policy of doubtful propriety to allow the selfishness of St. Paul to damage the interests of the whole state. I would respectfully suggest that the bill now before the 'house' giving aid to the 'People's Northern Pacific Railroad Company' is more likely to give us a road than any other project. I would not ask you to oppose the St. Paul interests, I would not advise it, but the considerations I have named if rightly understood will induce Congress to throw open the route for a proper competition and this is all we ask."

Donnelly, indeed, was taking more than an academic interest in the "People's Northern Pacific" proposition, and the friends of the Lake Superior and Mississippi were not a little anxious as to his ultimate stand, as is well evidenced by a communication from a Duluth correspondent:[45] "Private information from Washington represents that you are besieged with correspondence encouraging opposition to the proposed grant of land by Congress to aid in the construction of the Mississippi and Lake Superior Rail Road. It is perhaps needless for me to say that your constituents in this part of the district are unanimously in favor of such aid and that they expect the interest of the

[45] Sidney Luce to Donnelly, Duluth, February 1, 1864, Donnelly papers. Luke Marvin of Duluth, who was sojourning in St. Paul during the legislative session, being sent there to represent the interest of St. Louis county "in the Lobby," since there was no legislative representative from that region, wrote in much the same strain and with as much emphasis. Specifically he stated that an act encouraging the "People's Northern Pacific" company would jeopardize the whole scheme of a road from the Mississippi to the lake. February 5, 1864, Donnelly papers.

In a letter of February 11, Luce expressed greater anxiety. A letter of Donnelly's in the *St. Paul Daily Press* (written January 25, 1864), "gives me some uneasiness. Our Rail Road Co. & its friends as far as I am able to learn, feel that you are lending aid to their opponents." He went on to point out that the People's Northern Pacific bill would have a tendency to delay the building of a road and "eventually deprive our State of the benefits it ought to derive from the Lake terminus."

When Donnelly received a copy of the St. Paul city council's memorial and resolutions, accompanied by a letter from W. P. Murray, president of the council, he wrote a formal acknowledgement and stated what progress had been made to date. Donnelly to Murray, January 13, 1864, Donnelly papers. The original of the letter has the following incomplete paragraph crossed out:

"As the matter now stands, the road referred to in your communication is the only one which can connect the grain growing regions of the State with the waters of the Great Lakes;—the Missis. & Pacific R. R. Co.: having preferred, as I am informed, to acquiesce in the legislation of Congress which deflected a part of their land-grant to Lake Superior;—under these circumstances the needs and necessities of our agricultural population imperatively demand that every effort should be made to open—"

It appears that Donnelly, on second thought, was unwilling to commit himself irrevocably to either side of the dispute.

When, in the summer of 1864, Donnelly was in the midst of his campaign for reëlection, he stated in an open letter (*St. Paul Daily Press*, July 20, 1864): "My oponents have . . . asserted in the streets of St. Paul that my support of the Lake Superior Railroad bill was only secured through *bribery;* and further, that I have supported no measure in Congress, & performed for my constituents except upon the most corrupt and degrading terms as to my renomination." Donnelly offered to resign his seat in congress if any dishonest or dishonorable act in all his past life could be shown.

State generally will govern you in your action and efforts in relation thereto.'' Further information to the effect that the people of St. Louis county had unanimously resolved at a mass meeting to seek legislative sanction for the county's giving a bonus of $100,000 in aid of such a road added point to any remarks that might come from that quarter.

Both at home in Minnesota and with those who were in Washington to urge the grant for the road there appeared two views of the general proposition to locate the southern terminus of the road at a point other than St. Paul, or to have congress leave the location to local legislation. The friends of the St. Paul project believed the whole thing merely a device to throw dust in the eyes of the public, to complicate the matter in such a manner that no road would have sufficiently free field to warrant its prosecution, all of which meant, to them, leaving the field to the Wisconsin monopoly.[46] Outside of St. Paul there was a disposition on the part of critics to view the agitation as a manifestation of narrow self-interest on the part of the capital, taking no account of the welfare of the state and region as a whole. A denizen of St. Cloud, for example, in urging that any act of congress favoring a line from St. Paul to the Red river valley should provide for its touching St. Cloud, said: ''We are but 60 miles from Chanwatona, and a land grant from Lake Superior to St. Cloud via Chanwatona with a branch to St. Paul ought to suit everybody — the whole upper country and St. Paul and the Minnesota Valley and everyone else but perhaps Minneapolis will be satisfied if such an arrangement can be made.''[47]

[46] See *St. Paul Daily Press*, May 6, 1864, for an illustration of such a view.

[47] J. P. Wilson to Donnelly, St. Cloud, February 12, 1864, Donnelly papers. Both Minneapolis and St. Anthony were loath to contemplate any road to the lake which did not have them on its main line. A memorial signed by forty-seven prominent men of St. Anthony, March 31, 1864 (*ibid.*), looked with favor upon one of the propositions brought forward by the Wisconsin senators. This would provide a grant to a road from Sioux City, Iowa, to St. Paul, thence to Hudson and then continuing via the proposed St. Croix and Superior line to the lake. ''As our Representative we have to request that you secure to us at this important geographical and manufacturing point (if possible) a place on that line, by inserting in the Bill the words 'via the Falls of St. Anthony.' '' In such a case the road to be constructed could use the ten miles already built from St. Paul to St. Anthony, as well as ''12 miles of our western road lately turned over to Mess

In spite of the pressure brought to bear upon members of congress, however, the obvious, natural position of St. Paul gave it an argument which could not be easily overturned; the head of navigation of the Mississippi was at St. Paul, and it was desired to connect by rail the two great waterways, that of the lakes with that of the Mississippi. To be sure there was an open route up the Mississippi and the St. Croix, but should the railroad start from Hudson it placed at a distinct disadvantage the whole valley of the Minnesota river, with no compensating equivalent, for the most thickly settled portion of Minnesota would be less advantageously served from Hudson than it would from St. Paul.

Nevertheless, since the grant had been made to the state rather than to a particular company, while in accordance with precedent, it allowed a continuation of local strife which exhibited itself when the legislature took up the matter in the regular session of 1863-1864. According to one outspoken gentleman[48] the same men who had fought the proposition at Washington in the lobby and in committee were now present in force to take the grant away from the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad company, and so cut St. Paul off from the commercial benefits of the road. Quite as much to the point was an echo from Superior:

"The Hennepin delegation need no stimulant to defeat the object of the grant, and they become the tools of the monopoly without fee or reward. A railroad in Minnesota which does not begin at St. Anthony, end at Minneapolis, and avoid St. Paul, will receive the undivided most loyal opposition of that county, whose vote would be freely given to help enslave the white men of the State, tie her farmers to the Lake Michigan monopolies, sooner than see St. Paul receive a dime of benefit from a railroad to Lake Superior. The legislative talent of

Litchfield of New York, which will run to Minnetonka City, which is eleven miles to Shakopee. This is a matter of vital importance to Hennepin County & this point, we trust you will carry out our views — especially as no one can possibly be injured thereby."

[48] Letter to editor of the *St. Paul Daily Press*, February 1, 1864. When the agents of the road were in Washington they encountered "the unquenchable Bill King and the pertinacious Aldrich, while Cornell and Baldwin, absent in body, assaulted them with masked batteries of epistle."

that county is a dead weight upon the State, and has retarded its growth more than its Indian war."[49]

There was, in fact, a legal point which gave a lever to those who were attempting to block the whole measure. A federal grant had been given the state for a road from St. Paul to Lake Superior; the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad company apparently was legally entitled to the state grant of swamp lands and the quarter million dollar bonus from St. Paul. Nevertheless, in the Minnesota senate the question was raised as to whether there was then in existence a corporation legally entitled to these benefactions. By resolution[50] the senate called upon the attorney-general to answer these queries: (1) did the person named in the act incorporating the Nebraska and Lake Superior railroad company (May 23, 1857) ever become a legally incorporated person; (2) was the act of the state legislature of March 6, 1861, incorporating the same company, in accord with the constitution of the state, and did the persons named therein acquire any property, rights, or powers; (3) was the act extending the time allowed the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad company (the assignee of the Nebraska and Lake Superior company) for grading and completing its road (March 6, 1863) of any force of effect; (4) was the act authorizing the city of St. Paul to issue bonds in aid of the construction of this road valid; (5) was there any duly and constitutionally created or chartered corporation by the name of the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad company? The attorney-general pronounced against the validity of the old charter, but held that the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad company, under the general incorporation act of the state, was capable of receiving any grant of lands.[51]

All technical difficulties were obviated when the legislature

[49] *Superior Chronicle*, quoted in *St. Paul Daily Press*, February 4, 1865.

[50] *St. Paul Daily Press*, January 1, 1865.

[51] *Opinions of the attorneys general, Minnesota, 1858-1884*, 190-198. As to the Lake Superior and Mississippi railroad company, the attorney general, G. E. Cole, while maintaining that popular belief credited the company with having succeeded to the right and privileges of the old corporation, would not specifically state his acceptance of this view. "However this may be, it is certain that there does exist, and has existed since May 13th, 1864, a corporation, incorporated under the general law, under the name of the Lake Superior and Miss. RR Co."

passed a bill[52] by which the congressional land grant was bestowed upon this company, on condition that it deposited $20,000 with the state treasurer as evidence of its good faith, the sum to revert to the company as soon as ten miles should have been completed; furthermore the grants to the original company were transferred to the new organization under the original conditions.

The forfeit of $20,000 was duly deposited in June, 1865.[53] Although grading had begun as early as the summer of 1864 no real progress was made in the construction of the road until 1868 when thirty miles were completed. In 1871 the line was completed and the road was opened to traffic throughout its entire length of 155 miles, to the great rejoicing of the people of Minnesota. In the words of the railroad commissioner:

"The opening of the Lake Superior and Mississippi Railroad has been an era in the commerce of our State.

"It opens a new and important avenue to the great markets of the Atlantic seaboard; and must, as long as it forms an independent line, reduce transportation, and it is difficult to see how it can form any consolidation that would prevent a certain amount of competition. The lines heretofore constructed have led to Milwaukee and Chicago on Lake Michigan; this leads to Lake Superior. By an estimate furnished by me, about 2,000,000 bushels have been transported over this line to Duluth this season, at a reduced price of about five cents per bushel, which has left that amount in the hands of the producer.

"This competition has probably affected the price of transportation of at least half as much more, to a certain extent, probably two and one half cents per bushel. The $125,000 have been left in the hands of the producers of this State this season, by the opening of this new route, besides the amount saved in other articles of both export and import."[54]

[52] *Special laws of Minnesota, 1865,* 19-23. The bill was passed by the house, after "an exciting parliamentary contest," by a vote of 35 to 5; in the senate it was carried 16 to 0, with 4 not voting. *St. Paul Daily Press,* February 2, 16, 17, 1865.

[53] *Ibid.,* July 27, November 24, 1864. A map shows the status of railroads in the state in November, 1864.

[54] *Report of the railroad commissioner . . . for 1871,* 13.

In 1872 the road was leased to the Northern Pacific railroad, forming, with its branches, the principal line then operated by the leasing company.[55]

Lester Burrell Shippee

University of Minnesota
Minneapolis

[55] "Report of the railroad commissioner for 1872," in *Minnesota executive documents*, 142.

THE LITERARY SPIRIT AMONG THE EARLY OHIO VALLEY SETTLERS[1]

There is no intention in this paper to criticise or appreciate the early literary produce of the Ohio valley. A considerable argument might be raised as to whether there was any such produce but it can scarcely be denied that there was a literary spirit in the valley from the earliest years of the nineteenth century. There is likewise no attempt in this paper to limit the discussion to natives or make any discrimination between native born and immigrant.

John Filson had barely arrived in Kentucky when, like Boone, he was seized with an uncontrollable desire to write. Boone had traveled over a good part of southeastern United States while the country lay in its virgin beauty but seems never to have become enraptured until from the foothills of Crab Orchard he looked out over the blue grass valley of Kentucky. It is impossible to believe the hard-headed old hunter was deceived. Years afterward when describing the event to John Filson he paced back and forth slapping his thighs with his hands, and struggling in his limited vocabulary to find words to express the emotion which possessed him. What would have been the result had his poetic ability been as well cultivated as his ability with the long rifle? Filson, an itinerant schoolmaster, was so impressed with Boone's story that he at once put it in what he called literary clothes and hastened east to find a publisher.

Even Captain Gilbert Imlay, interested primarily in real estate, was not impervious to the influence of nature in the backwoods. He is thus driven to say of Kentucky:

"Everything here assumes a dignity and splendor I have not seen in any other part of the world. Here an eternal verdure

[1] This paper was prepared for the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association held in St. Paul, May 9-11, 1918, but was not read on that occasion.

reigns, and the brilliant sun piercing through the azure heavens, produces in this prolific soil an early maturity which is truly astonishing. Soft zephyrs gently breathe on sweets, and the inhaled air gives a voluptuous glow of health and vigor that seem to ravish the intoxicated senses."[2]

François Michaux, the celebrated naturalist, traveling down the Ohio in 1802, was astounded at the size of the forest trees, one of which measured upward of forty feet in circumference four feet from the ground.[3] Washington had measured this tree twenty years before and Michaux verified his measurements. Such trees might be expected to excite even a New Englander into extravagance of statement.

Thomas Nuttall, another scientist, traveling down the Ohio river in 1818, spoke of the scenery as follows:

"The Occidental wilderness appears here to retain its primeval solitude; its gloomy forests are yet unbroken by the hand of man, they are only penetrated by the wandering hunter and the roaming savage. How many ages may yet elapse before these luxuriant wilds of the Mississippi can enumerate a population equal to the Tartarian desert?"[4]

Thousands of volumes of "travels" such as have been quoted —Isaac Weld, C. F. Volney, Thomas Ashe, H. M. Brackenridge, T. M. Harris, Timothy Flint, John Bradbury, and a score of others—were sold in the valley in the first four decades of the nineteenth century. The extravagance of statement by these writers was not without a cause and that same cause operated upon the generation of writers who followed them. Many of these travelers were men of sound scholarship, and their influ-

[2] Gilbert Imlay, *A topographical description of the western territory of North America; containing a succinct account of its climate, natural history, population, agriculture, manners and customs, with an ample description of the several divisions into which that country is partitioned, and an accurate statement of the various tribes of Indians that inhabit the frontier country. To which is annexed, a delineation of the laws and government of the state of Kentucky. Tending to show the probable rise and grandeur of the American empire* (London, 1792) 1: 56.

[3] *Early western travels, 1748-1846; a series of annotated reprints of some of the best and rarest contemporary volumes of travel, descriptive of the aborigines and social and economic conditions in the middle and far west, during the period of early American settlement* (R. G. Thwaites, ed. — Cleveland, 1904-1907), 3: 175.

[4] Quoted by William H. Venable, *Beginnings of literary culture in the Ohio valley. Historical and biographical sketches* (Cincinnati, 1891), 21.

ence on the younger writers can easily be traced. In many homes these "travels" were the nearest approximation to fiction that would be tolerated. How prevalent was their peculiar style can only be realized by reading the stories in the dozen or more literary magazines which were published in the Ohio valley preceding the civil war.

The early settlers had great respect for the spoken word. Orators abounded. The endurance of audiences is almost past belief. At fourth of July banquets the participants often sat from one o'clock till candlelight listening to the loud, bombastic sonorous toasts in praise of freedom and the heroes of the revolution. Liberal quantities of liquor helped to sustain the listeners but the fact is evident that they possessed a power of attending beyond what we now have. Joint political discussions lasted throughout the day—six or eight hours. Arguments on abstract questions of theology by opposing clergymen often went into the second or third day, the audience still holding on.

In character this oratory was much like the prose mentioned above. Extravagant statement made in a stentorian voice was most appreciated. The following quotation from a fourth of July address by Samuel Findlay, at Cincinnati, 1824, will recall many like it which have been delivered in the valley in the past century:

"This declaration in a voice louder than the thunders of Heaven reaching the throne of the tyrant, shook it to its base, and from the crown of him who sat upon it fell its richest jewel. On the annunciation of it, war, descending on our plains, was seen marshalling his hosts for the bloody conflict. Ocean, siding with his tyrant, heaved his agitated bosom, and rolled his angry billows on our shore; and fearful uncertainty cast its gloom over the land; but her eagle taking his flight from the mountains towered in his pride of place, and America spreading wide her banners, went forth to battle."[5]

Nor was this style confined to fourth of July declamation. The following is from an annual message of the third governor of Indiana:

"The genius of liberty, from soaring triumphant with the Eagle and Star Spangled Banner of America, has taken her

[5] *Cincinnati literary gazette*, July 24, 1824.

flight across the Atlantic, to career, for awhile, with the lilies and tri-color of France. This celebrated flag, the emblem of popular supremacy and prostrate royalty, now waves unmolested over noble and gallant France. A republican monarchy is erected upon the ruins of the absolute throne of the Bourbon. A limited constitutional King, sways a mild sceptre, and is now delivering lectures on practical freedom to Europe. Their force is felt, and neither the Alps nor the Pyrenees, oppose barriers to their march. The spirit they breathe, has already shaken the dynasties of Europe from the little witless despotism of Brunswick, up to the iron throne of Nicholas. The Frank and the Hibernian, the Britain and the Scot, the Spaniard and the German, the Portuguese and the Netherlander, the Prussian and the Austrian, the Greek and the Italian, and even the cold Muscovite, are common worshippers at her shrine. Hope is strengthened by desire, that she may continue to brandish her flaming flambeau, until civilized Europe and in time the whole earth, are ignited with as pure a flame, as now burns throughout the two Americas."[6]

The preachers, if it were possible, surpassed the lawyers in this fustian, as is evidenced by this gem from a sermon by James McGready, the principal preacher at the Cane Ridge revival of 1800:

"When the fiends of hell dragged him into the eternal gulf, he roared and screamed and yelled like a devil. When, while Indians, Pagans, and Mohammedans stood amazed and upbraided him, falling like Lucifer, from the meridian blaze of the Gospel and the threshold of heaven, sinking into the liquid, boiling waves of hell, and accursed sinners of Tyre and Sidon and Sodom and Gomorrah sprang to the right and left and made way for him to pass them and fall lower down even to the deepest cavern in the flaming abyss. Here his consciousness like a never-dying worm stings him and forever gnaws his soul; and the slighted blood of the Son of God communicates ten thousand hells in one! Now through the blazing flames of hell he sees that heaven he has lost—that exceeding great and eternal weight of glory he has sold for the devil's pottage!"[7]

[6] *Journal of the house of representatives of Indiana*, fifteenth session, 1830, p. 10.

[7] Catherine C. Cleveland, *The great revival in the west, 1797-1805* (Chicago, [1916]), 45.

Hundreds of verses from as many western poets could be cited to show the strength of this same sort of appeal. William Dana Emerson thus closed his ode to the Ohio river:

"I have gazed upon thy beauty,
Till my heart is wed to thee;
Teach it to flow o'er life's long plain,
In tranquil majesty;
Its channel growing deep and wide—
May Heaven's own sea receive its tide!"[8]

A dozen poems may be found addressed to Daniel Boone. Tecumseh, Simon Kenton, and Lewis Wetzel were almost as popular.

"Stout-hearted Lewis Wetzel
Rode down the river shore,
The wilderness behind him
And the wilderness before."[9]

Witness, too, the closing stanza of William W. Fosdick's panegyric on the "Woods of the west":

"When at last the pioneers are gone
And all the generous impulses they bore
Vanish like flowers, fading on the lawn,
Toll heaven's bells—Columbia is no more."[10]

The following lines are from James R. Barrick's ode to "The forest stream:"

"Hastening onward—onward ever,
Like the life that flows in me,
As a wave upon the river
Hastening onward to the sea;
As a hope the hidden future
Scanning for the things to be."[11]

Opening the first volume of Timothy Flint's *Western monthly,* published at Cincinnati, 1828, there appears the verse:

"Cerulean lake of mystery! 'mid the moan," . . . the

[8] William T. Coggeshall, *Poets and poetry of the west: with biographical and critical notices* (Columbus, Ohio, 1860), 286.

[9] *Ibid.,* 586.

[10] *Ibid.,* 476.

[11] *Ibid.,* 574.

first line of Micah P. Flint's poem "Wakulla fountain." There can be no doubt of the situation here. Not every courtship of the muse results in a wedding but no one but a wooer would call blue, "cerulean," not to mention phrasing " 'mid the moan." A young writer in the same monthly describing the "Burial of the young Apalachy warrior" says "the sun raises his broadened and purple disc above the level summit of the forests, and a thousand birds hail his cheery glory with their song." Micah Flint introduces his "The camp meeting" with:

> "There is a lovely vale, that, isle-like, sleeps
> Embosom'd in the rough and craggy hills
> Of Tennessee. Girt round, as with a storm
> Toss'd sea, by mountains hoar, precipitous
> And wild, its verdant basin lies at rest,
> And in the summer-sunshine smiles, as 'twere
> A soft and beauteous dimple on the harsh
> And furrow'd visage of the land."[12]

The sky is the "blue canopy" or the "welkin"; valleys are "vales"; islands are "isles"; the forests are "edens" or "shady bowers"; winds are "zephyrs"; there are "low voiced brooks," "pendant clusters of enpurpling grapes"; May was "dripping-locked, and rosy vested, violet slippered, rainbow-crested, girdled with the eglantine"; "odors and exhortations sweeten the lapsing years"; spring is the "floral calends"; "the crested waves roll on the strand" "The pale stars, night's loveliest gems deck the bosom of the blue midnight." These expressions are culled from such writers as Salmon P. Chase, James H. Perkins, and George D. Prentice and not from backwoods verse-mongers. They are the natural expressions of the best of the western men when in poetic mood. Most of these men had received classical educations and their foreign mode of expression seems to hail from that source. Such men as Clay, Thomas Corwin, and Lincoln were able to dispense with this style and in the native language of the valley reached a level of excellence not surpassed by Americans. Pseudo-classicism, however, continued to hamper the amateur poets down to W. D. Howells, John Hay, and James Whitcomb Riley. It is hardly necessary to point out that the prose and poetry

[12] Coggeshall, *Poets and poetry of the west*, 59.

of the period is readable about in proportion as the writers freed themselves from this false style. Occasionally as in Coates Kinney's "Rain on the roof" or William O. Butler's "The boatman's horn" a writer forgets to put on his poetic robes and gives us a readable poem in the simple English of the valley.

On the prairies of southern Illinois there lived a considerable colony of Englishmen settled by Morris Birkbeck. At New Harmony, Indiana, lived the Owens community, some of whose members, like McClure, came to be known throughout the world. In a suburb of Cincinnati lived a score or so of Nantucket whalers whose delight was to spin yarns of chasing "sea shouldering" whales through the seven seas. Throughout the valley were veterans of Napoleon's grand army who were responsible for many a reminiscence of the old wars. At Gallipolis and Vevay were colonies of French who maintained in comparative purity their ancient customs. In Cincinnati lived Joshua Wyeth, the last survivor, it was thought, of the Boston tea party. The Duke of Saxe Weimar, Chateaubriand, Count Volney, the Third Napoleon, and a prince of Murat were all known in the valley. On the hills back of Madison, Indiana, was a considerable colony of Scotch; while Germans and Irish of high and low degree, direct from the old country, could be found in every community. Thomas Nuttall, arriving in Louisville, November 23, 1818, was impressed with the mingling of the people. "A stranger who descends the Ohio at this season of emigration cannot but be struck with the jarring vortex of heterogeneous population amidst which he is embarked."

What influence these foreigners had on the literary style of the native writers would be hard to say, but they outdid the natives in the extravagance of their statements and it would doubtless not be too much to say that the natives to some extent used them as models.

A second characteristic of early western literature, as of early western life, is its pathos. All western people seem to have been subject to melancholy, especially when alone. In its highest form it was pathos but more often only a case of the blues or merely mooning. Its source is to be found deep in the experience of the people. The settlers were a race of refugees. Their ancestors had left the old country for various

reasons. Quakers, Huguenots, Salzburgers, Presbyterians, puritans, cavaliers, roundheads, all were nonconformists. The wrench given their nervous systems by the emigrations had left a permanent impression. "Roam" and "home," one expressing a fact, the other an ideal, are worn threadbare in the poetry, and especially in the ballads, of the western country. Many of the experiences of the emigrants had been such as to deepen this tendency to melancholy. Breaking away from old friends and establishing new friendships; the hardships of emigrant travel; disease and deaths on the way; the prevalence of sickness in a new country, and especially the custom of neighbors' performing all the offices of physician, nurse, and undertaker; the continual inroads by Indians; hardships and accidents incident to pioneer life; all these combined to produce a strain of sadness in natures otherwise so full of vivacity that its influence is noticeable only when the persons are alone.

The ordinary ballads of the times are all permeated with this attempt at pathos, though the singers usually made no attempt to be pathetic. "Poor sweet Lily Dale" was laid to rest in the vale. "Sweet William on his deathbed lay in love with Barbra Allen" and Barbra straightway died of a broken heart, so the ballad states. It is worth noting that such songs as "Dixie," "Carry me back to old Virginia," "Swanee river," "Old Kentucky home," and the like are from south of Mason and Dixon's line.

General William O. Butler, candidate for vice president on the ticket with Lewis Cass in 1848, closes his delightful poem "The boatman's horn" with these verses:

> "Then, boatman, wind that horn again!
> Though much of sorrow mark its strain,
> Yet are its notes to sorrow dear;
> What though they wake fond memory's tear!
> Tears are sad memory's sacred feast,
> And rapture oft her chosen guest."[13]

One who has read the biting editorials of George D. Prentice in the old *Louisville Journal* would hardly suspect him of tender-heartedness, yet when in the poetic mood he melted just as

[13] Coggeshall, *Poets and poetry of the west*, 173.

did his poetic contemporaries. The following lines are from his poem "Written at my mother's grave":

"And must I linger here,
To stain the plumage of my sinless years,
And mourn the hopes to childhood dear
With bitter tears?

"Ay, must I linger here,
A lonely branch upon a withered tree,
Whose last frail leaf, untimely sere,
Went down with thee?"[14]

Elijah P. Lovejoy, a native of Maine, son of a Presbyterian minister, an uncompromising fighter who was finally killed by a mob at Alton, Illinois, as a poet could write such lines as these:

"My heart has since been sadly worn,
While wave on wave has o'er it borne;
And feelings once all fresh and green,
Are now as though they ne'er had been.
And Hope, that bright and buoyant thing,
E'en hope has lent despair its wing,
And sits despoiled within my breast,
A timid, torturing, trembling guest!
I dare not look upon the past,
I care not for the future cast."[15]

The newspapers of the valley usually carried a column of poetry, mostly local, in each issue. Much of this was memorial. The following, though much above the average, will serve as an illustration. Four of the six children of the author, Mrs. Julia Dumont of Vevay, had died during childhood. Her case was not much different in this respect from that of the majority of pioneer mothers. The stanzas are from "The Mother to her dying infant."

"Child of my bosom, how deep thy decay,
Life, thy last tint is now fading away;

[14] Coggeshall, *Poets and poetry of the west*, 128.
[15] *Ibid.*, 80.

Death, his pale seal on thy cheek has imprest,
Babe of my love, thou art hast'ning to rest.

* * *

"Loveless and cold then my pathway is left,
Hope, of its blossoms eternally reft,
Summon'd to bliss, my lost cherub shall rise
Pure and immortal, a child of the skies"[16]

Another flood of verse, at least pathetic in expression, has to do with love lorn lasses and laddies. The memorial verses were honest attempts to express honest sorrow but most of this latter kind is mere mooning. The two following specimens are taken from the same random page in the *Cincinnati literary gazette* for August 21, 1824:

"By yon sun of golden hue,
By the heaven's celestial blue,
By the image I love most true,
This heart can ne'er forget thee.

"But bitter, bitter are the tears
Of her who slighted love bewails;
No hope her dreary prospect cheers,
No pleasing melancholy hails.
Her's are the pangs of wounded pride.
Of blasted hope, of wither'd joy;
The flattering veil is rent aside,
The flame of Love burns to destroy."[17]

Enough of such stuff could be culled from the newspapers of the valley before the civil war to make a book as large as the *Britannica.*

Lincoln was given to spells of meditation or melancholy, which at times led his enemies to question his sanity.[18] John Hay, a

[16] *Cincinnati literary gazette,* January 10, 1824, 16.

[17] *Ibid.,* August 21, 1824, 64.

[18] William H. Herndon and Jesse W. Weik, *Abraham Lincoln; the true story of a great life* (New York, 1892), 1: 129 ff. His fondness for the poem "Old mortality" was notorious. See also John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln: a history* (New York, 1890), 1: 187, quoting Orville H. Browning: "'I think,' says Mr. Browning, 'it was only an intensification of his constitutional melancholy; his trials and embarrassments pressed him down to a lower point than usual.'" Nico-

graduate of Brown, was likewise given to "mooning" at which times he would express himself in such mournful manner that one might think all his friends had deliberately abandoned him. Thus:

"In a glimmering kingdom of woe
On a plain demon haunted I lie
And the spectres that glide to and fro
With their wings blot the joy of the sky."

As late as 1839 he wrote to a friend: "I have wandered this winter in the valley of the shadow of death. All the Universe, God, earth, and heaven have been to me but vague and gloomy phantoms. I have sat long hours by the sandy marge of my magnificent river, and felt the awful mystery of its unending flow and heard an infinite lament breathed in the unquiet murmur of its whispering ripples."

Another source of literary inspiration was the schools of Kentucky and Ohio, and the literary societies and magazines connected with them. The parent institution was Transylvania college at Lexington, opened as an academy at the home of the Reverend David Rice at Danville in 1785. In 1788 it was removed to Lexington where under Henry Toulmin, James Moore, James Blythe, and Horace Holley,—the latter a graduate of Yale and a close friend of President Timothy Dwight,—it attained national reputation. The school was as strictly classical as Yale or Princeton from which it drew its inspiration; at every commencement part of the exercises was in Latin or Greek. Such teachers as Judge Jesse Bledsoe of the law school, Samuel Brown, Benjamin W. Duley, Daniel Drake, and Charles Caldwell of the medical school were favorably known throughout the United States; and their students not only led their own professions throughout the west but in their leisure time produced a large part of its literature.

R. H. Bishop, later president of Miami, Thomas J. Matthews,

lay, who also knew western life well, adds: "This taint of constitutional sadness was not peculiar to Lincoln; it may be said to have been endemic among the early settlers of the West. It had its origin partly in the circumstances of their lives, the severe and dismal loneliness in which their struggle for existence for the most part went on." See also Hamlin Garland, *A son of the middle border* (New York, 1917).

later a teacher at Miami and at Woodward college, C. S. Rafinesque, a Greek scientist, Dr. Joseph Buchanan, later editor of the *Lexington Reporter, Frankfort Palladium,* and the *Louisville Focus* which became *Prentice's Journal,* all graced the literary department of Transylvania. The college library compared favorably with any library in the United States. The curriculum was practically the same as the courses of study of Yale, Harvard, Dartmouth, and Princeton. Literary societies with Greek names were organized and conducted in a way similar to those in the older eastern colleges. Text books in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew were prepared and published at Cincinnati or Lexington.

A score or more of colleges and classical schools along the same general lines as Transylvania flourished during the decades from 1810 to 1840 in Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana.

From time to time there appeared such literary papers as the *Medley,* of Lexington (1803-4); *Western review,* of Lexington (1819-21); the *Literary cadet,* of Cincinnati (1819); the *Olio,* of Cincinnati (1820-21); the *Literary gazette,* of Cincinnati (1824); *Western review,* of Cincinnati (1827-30); *Hall's Illinois magazine,* (1830); *Hall's western magazine* (1832); and the *Western messenger* (1835-41). As many more might be named, all equally short-lived except the *Ladies' repository,* of Cincinnati (1841-1876). Nearly all these reviews were edited by school men, or men trained in the classical schools. In the *Cincinnati literary gazette* of 1824, appeared a number of Latin poems produced in Ohio and Kentucky.

One purpose of these reviews was to inform the eastern people that there was a west and that it had at least literary aspirations, if not a literature. A Kentuckian who visited New York in the twenties complained that New Yorkers knew less of Kentucky and the west than they did of China.

"I am continually amused in these regions with the inquiries, which are constantly proposed to me, touching our Western world. True, we meet with people in the cities, and on the beaten routes of travel, who are tolerably informed, respecting the country. But the mass of the Atlantic people have less exact knowledge about us, than they have about the Chinese.

The people from the eastern cities, who visit Washington, while congress is in session, are astonished beyond measure, when they see a western member on the floor. That he should know how to stand gracefully, and make gestures, and speak the king's English, and pursue a connected train of thought and reasoning, and talk away, like a Philadelphia lawyer, is matter of infinite wonderment. Most of the people imagine a western backwoods man to be a kind of humanized Ourang Outang, like my lord Manboddo's man, recently divested of the unsightly appendage of a tail."[19]

"Some gentlemen from the old states might learn something new to them in the history of civilization would they but visit that western world of which they often seem to me to know so little. They might see there, in the very spot where yesterday the wild beasts of the wilderness seized their prey by night and made their covert lair by day, on the same spot to-day stands the common school house filled alike with the children of the rich and the poor, those children who are to be the future voters, officers and statesmen of the republic. Over that vast region so lately red with the blood of savage war, the seedfields of knowledge are planted, and a smiling harvest of civilization springs up, and there too may be seen what a christian statesman might admire. The schoolmaster is not alone. That holy religion which is at last the only sure basis of permanent social or political improvement has here its voices crying in the wilderness. Almost on the burning embers of the war-fire round which but yesterday some barbarous chief recounted to his listening tribe with horrid exultation his deeds of savage heroism to-day is built a temple dedicated to that religion which announces peace on earth good will to men."[20]

How far the commercial desire inspired the western writers one cannot tell but it had some influence. Nor was there an entire lack of a book market in the valley. One writer states that all the "tin-wagon, pit-coal-indigo, wooden-nutmeg, and

[19] Timothy Flint, in *Western monthly review*, 1828, 88.

[20] William H. Venable, *Footprints of the pioneers*, 98, quoting one of the most eloquent Ohio orators of the early period. The selection is also a good example of early verdure.

wooden-clock'' peddlers of Connecticut then operating in the west had suddenly turned into book agents. Their books were said to be out-of-date editions and unsalable books of New England refurnished with new dates and gaudy illustrations. We only need refer to tradition to prove how successful were these locusts in gulling the people. It may easily be surmised that many a westerner imagined he could equal the literary work in these books.

In his ''Editor's address'' in the opening number of the *Western magazine and review* (May, 1827), Timothy Flint, himself a New Englander of Welsh extraction, a graduate of Harvard in the class of 1800, calls the 4,000,000 people then living in the valley ''a scribbling and forth-putting people'' with thousands of orators and poets and not a single journal to ''echo public literary opinion.'' He continues:

''We have seen, and we therefore know what one, who has not seen can not know, with what a curl of the lip, and crook of the nose an Atlantic reviewer contemplates the idea of a work written west of the Alleghany mountains. What, say they, a backwoods man write! A poet make verses on Red river near the borders of Arkansas! who ever heard of any thing worth remembering, that was written anywhere, except in Europe, or at least in Boston, or New York? Where could a writer be even supposed capable of gaining any adequate conceptions of the splendors of the meridian sun, except in a high and dark city cock-loft, illumined at mid day by the sure and cloudless light of a candle? Where could he feel the genuine inspirations of nature, except in such a spirit-stirring apartment, and contemplating a single bilious hydrangium in a red earthen flower pot?''[21] Throughout the ten pages of the ''Address'' editor Flint complains that neither English nor eastern American reviews give western writers their dues.

In summing up the literary characteristics as they appear in these old reviews and their newspapers three sources of inspiration are suggested: the overpowering grandeur of nature, the peculiar character of the people influenced by their hard

[21] *Western monthly review*, 1828, 10.

experience for two centuries,[22] their political and religious beliefs which were dominated by an intense passion for freedom; and lastly the influence of schools and travelers bringing the classical training of older civilization. These sources of inspiration produced in the first place a bombastic exaggeration expressed in the high sounding phrases and sentences of the glorious English revolution of 1688; in the second place a tendency to pathos; and in the third place a lavish imitation of the classics.

Logan Esarey

University of Indiana
Bloomington

[22] Nowhere is the unconscious pathos of the western emigrant so well expressed as in "The movers," by William D. Howells:

"Parting was over at last, and all the good-byes had been spoken.
Up the long hill-side the white-tented wagon moved slowly,
Bearing the mother and children while onward before them the father
Trudged with his gun on his arm, and the faithful house-dog beside him,
Grave and sedate, as if knowing the sorrowful thoughts of his master."

THE LOST COMMISSION: A STUDY IN MISSISSIPPI HISTORY[1]

"About this time [1844]," says Claiborne in his history of Mississippi, "an incident occurred that created some excitement in Mississippi. Mr. [Robert J.] Walker being assured of a position in the Cabinet, transmitted his resignation as Senator, by a confidential friend, to Gov. Brown. On its reception the Governor filled out a commission for Hon. J. Thompson, then one of the representatives from Mississippi, and transmitted the same to Walker, to be delivered on his confirmation to a seat in the Cabinet. This commission, for reasons of his own, Walker never delivered. He never communicated the facts to Thompson with whom he was in daily association. It seems that on resigning he had urged the appointment of Gwin, and withheld the commission hoping that his recommendation, deriving additional force from his position in the Cabinet, might be adopted."[2]

Before undertaking to set forth the circumstances connected with this incident, it will be of interest to survey the political situation as it existed in Mississippi at the close of the Tyler administration. In spite of the "somewhat artificial basis" upon which the popularity of Jackson rested in the south, there existed in Mississippi no such intense hatred for his successor as was entertained for Van Buren in some other southern states, as for instance in South Carolina. So far as the whigs were concerned, some of their organs declared that the democrats had been hunting for an excuse for three years to drop Van Buren;[3] consolation was derived from a reputed saying of Mississippi boatmen that "*things* among the Democrats *is* mightily mixed up," and that the followers of Van Buren would never support

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Paul, Minnesota, May 9, 1918.

[2] John F. H. Claiborne, *Mississippi as a province, territory and state, with biographical notices of eminent citizens* (Jackson, Mississippi, 1880), 438.

[3] *Constitutionalist*, May 11, 1844; cf. Jesse S. Reeves, *American diplomacy under Tyler and Polk* (Baltimore, 1907), 121.

James K. Polk.[4] By some whig journals the nomination of Van Buren was deemed unavoidable, and, it is almost needless to add, his defeat certain.[5] The sentiment of the whig party in Mississippi in 1844 was accurately reflected in the statement, "We go for Henry Clay, Texas or no Texas."[6] To the whigs of this state the defeat of their great leader was simply inconceivable, regardless of his attitude on the leading question of the day, and irrespective of whoever might be the nominee of the opposing party.[7]

By the democratic journals and party leaders of Mississippi it was confidently believed that Van Buren would receive the nomination of his party. In the early part of 1843 the *Mississippi Free Trader*—the leading democratic organ in the state—predicted the nomination either of Van Buren or of John C. Calhoun.[8] The latter was uniformly referred to in eulogistic terms by the editors of the state, regardless of party affiliations, but was consistently opposed by the leading politicians.[9] In the democratic state convention held at Jackson in January, 1844, forty-four counties being represented, Martin Van Buren received sixty-two votes of the delegates present, while Calhoun received only twenty; for vice-president, Polk received fifty-one votes, and R. M. Johnson, twenty-nine. One of the five electors chosen by this same convention was Jefferson Davis, of Warren county, who distinguished himself by his eulogy of Calhoun.[10] By the *Vicksburg Sentinel*, the exponent of the radical wing of the party in the state, the nominee of the Jackson convention

[4] *Constitutionalist*, May 15, August 14, 1844.

[5] *Port Gibson Herald*, May 23, 1844.

[6] *Constitutionalist*, May 15, 1844.

[7] Sentiments similar to these were expressed by leading whigs of Georgia. See letter of Alexander Stephens in "The correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, and Howell Cobb," edited by Ulrich B. Phillips, in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1911 (Washington, 1913), 2: 58.

[8] *Mississippi Free Trader*, January 11, February 1, 1843.

[9] In an "Address to the people of Mississippi," May, 1835, John F. H. Claiborne said: "I am more of a States Right man than many among you who shout hosannas to Mr. Calhoun." Claiborne correspondence, manuscripts in state archives of Mississippi. In 1842, Robert J. Walker, who is represented as the consistent opponent of Calhoun, spoke of the latter's talents and integrity in the highest terms, and predicted that if he were nominated he would certainly be elected. *Ibid.*, cf. *Columbus Democrat*, February 1, 1845.

[10] *Mississippi Free Trader*, January 17, 1844.

was referred to in terms little short of fulsome; he was, it said, "never so popular as at present."[11] Eight years before a leading organ of the democratic party had printed an editorial of which the refrain was:

"Cotton is rising
Van Buren is coming,"

and had predicted that the "people of the state would never abandon Mr. Van Buren until they became blind to the past and reckless to the future."[12] This same journal declared that the administration of Andrew Jackson had done more for southern interests than all preceding administrations combined.[13] An address of the democratic committee of Mississippi declared that Van Buren was entitled to the heart-felt gratitude of every citizen of Mississippi.

"Fellow citizens," ran the address, "are you prepared to abandon Andrew Jackson, his principles, and measures, to gratify the ambitious aspirations of Hugh L. White? Who is Andrew Jackson, and what are his principles, his services and measures, that you should now unite with the nullifiers, in driving him in disgrace to the Hermitage? He is the same scar-covered patriot, who shed his blood in your defence in the war of the revolution, who toiled for you through fatigue and danger in the wilds of Alabama, who protected your wives and children from the tomahawk and scalping knife of the savage, who saved the great emporium of the west from a foreign enemy, and terminated our second struggle with Great Britain, with glory and renown . . . the very farms you cultivate would now be occupied by the savages, but for the treaties negotiated by him." Despite this impassioned appeal in behalf of the "Old Hero" and the gratitude which was felt toward him for the removal of the Indians, Mississippi in 1836 was only held in the democratic column by a greatly reduced majority over that of four years before.

It may safely be said that but for Van Buren's Texas letter, he would never have been so readily cast aside by the party leaders of Mississippi in 1844. For if there was one thing upon

[11] *Vicksburg Sentinel*, February 28, March 29, 1844.
[12] *Mississippian*, October 7, 1836.
[13] *Ibid.*

which the democracy of Mississippi was of one mind and one purpose, it was the immediate annexation of Texas, and woe betide the candidate who ventured to obstruct or to turn aside the steadfast purpose of those bent upon achieving that object. This purpose had been set forth in no uncertain tone in the messages of governors, the resolutions of the legislature, in countless editorials, and in no end of resolutions passed by democratic meetings and Texas associations. There was one sentiment voiced in all these expressions of opinion: that the annexation of Texas was vital to the security of the institutions of the south; at the same time manifold other blessings were recounted which would redound to the country as a whole as a result of this great measure.

There was nothing surprising in this attitude on the part of Mississippi. Before Texas had achieved its independence, voices were raised in the state in advocacy of annexation. In a speech made at Raymond, a little town not far from Jackson, in the fall of 1835, Robert J. Walker replying to Franklin E. Plummer in the senatorial canvass of that year pronounced himself in favor of acquiring Texas by treaty; for this would give the south and southwest six additional slave states. Thus did the man who, more than any other, brought the Texas question within the domain of practical politics, sound the keynote of the campaign of 1844.[14] The *Woodville Republican*, a whig journal, pronounced in favor of annexation;[15] the *Free Trader* characterized as a palpable falsehood the charge of the *Natchez Courier* that Van Buren was opposed to Texas, and that it was owing to his influence that Jackson had not taken a more decided stand upon the subject.[16] In the summer of 1837 a select com-

[14] *Mississippian*, September 18, 1835. Cf. "Diplomatic correspondence of the republic of Texas," edited by George P. Garrison, in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1908 (Washington, 1909-1911), 1: 317, where it is printed out how the acquisition of Texas would give the south a preponderance in the senate.

[15] *Woodville Republican*, December 10, 1836.

[16] *Mississippi Free Trader*, September 1, 1836. It is hardly correct to say, however, as has been alleged, that the subject of annexation was never lost sight of in the state from 1836 to 1844. So far as the newspapers are concerned, annexation was dropped almost entirely out of sight after the winning of Texas independence until 1843. A file of the weekly *Mississippi Free Trader* extending from July 30, 1839, to July 2, 1840, contains over sixty references to Texas but not one to annexation; in the same journal from August 25, 1842, to the close of that year, there are eighteen items dealing with Texas, one of which bears upon the annexation question;

mittee of the legislature to which had been referred a memorial of sundry citizens of Hinds county relative to the expediency of receiving Texas, resolved that "the annexation of Texas is essential to the future safety and repose of the southern states;" the Mississippi senators and congressmen were requested to further annexation as early as practicable. These resolutions were unanimously adopted by the house.[17] There was another subject closely related to the Texas question, upon which unanimity of opinion also prevailed; this was the slavery question. The members of the house declared that "the South does not possess within her limits a blessing, with which the affections of her people are so closely intertwined and so completely enfibred, and whose value is more highly appreciated."[18]

Second only in importance to the acquisition of Texas as a means of increasing the political weight of the south in the councils of the nation was the argument founded on the danger to be apprehended from Great Britain's securing a foothold in that region; the antipathy to that power and suspicion of her nefarious designs to use Texas as a lever for freeing the slaves in the south made many a Mississippi editor boil with rage.

The appearance of Van Buren's letter upon the Texas question called forth varied comments from the party organs within the state. In the opinion of the *Mississippian* his views and arguments should be fairly weighed; it dwelt upon his statement that "the American continent can no longer be considered subject to foreign colonization." The democracy of Mississippi should proceed cautiously in pledging men not to vote for any anti-annexation candidate; the south must beware of deserting its "natural allies," the democracy of the north; the shibboleth of annexation should not take precedence of all other questions, for thus would the hot-headed movements of some result in the electoral vote of the state being given for Clay. This same journal admitted, however, that Van Buren's letter had caused many

a complete file of the weekly edition for 1841 contains sixty allusions to Texas, two of which refers to annexation. A complete file of the *Woodville Republican* for 1840 contains twenty news references to Texas, but not a single allusion to annexation. Cf. Justin H. Smith, *Annexation of Texas* (New York, 1911), 71.

[17] *Niles' Weekly Register*, 52: 258.

[18] Cf. Cleo Hearon, "Mississippi and the compromise of 1850," in Mississippi historical society, *Publications*, 14: 14. See also *Niles' Weekly Register*, 64: 173.

of his friends to hesitate. It was clear that the sole object of Tyler in thrusting the annexation question into politics was to erect a political guillotine for Van Buren, throw the mass of the party into confusion, and thereby secure a rally to himself at the Baltimore convention.[19]

By the *Columbus Democrat* the letter of Van Buren was characterized as "a most able and elaborate document." Disapproval was expressed of the tone of some rather extreme resolutions adopted by the Texas annexation association of Holmes county at Franklin on May 18. These asserted that the time had arrived when the people of the south and west had a right to demand annexation, which, so far as the south was concerned, was one with the right of self-preservation; "the opposition of Van Buren and Clay was nothing more than a mere temporising measure of political chicanery to secure the support of northern abolitionists."[20] Herein are represented the views of the radical element of the party, of the "chivalry" or left wing as it was dubbed by the more conservative democrats and whigs. Felix Huston, who figured prominently in the Texas revolution, was one of the leaders of this element. The *Jeffersonian* admitted that the letter of the ex-president displayed much ability, but "it fails to convince us that he is right."[21] The *Mississippi Free Trader* frankly admitted its disappointment at the sentiments expressed by Van Buren with reference to annexation;[22] the *Vicksburg Sentinel and Expositor* expressed its admiration for "the delicacy and honesty of the man," but failed to be convinced by his arguments. "We go for Texas *now*—for Texas always." "What thinks the Democracy of the gifted and

[19] The sentiments of the followers of "Johnny Tyler" were thus expressed:

"Van, Van, Van,
Is a used up man—
The war cry
Is Tex and Ty!
You know it,
We go it,
Hip and thigh
For Tex and Ty."

Mississippian, May 15, 22, 29, 1844. Cf. *Mississippi Free Trader*, May 29, 1844.

[20] *Columbus Democrat*, May 11, June 8, 1844.

[21] *Jeffersonian*, May 18, 1844.

[22] *Mississippi Free Trader*, May 15, 1844.

patriotic Buchanan?" it asked, and added that if a northern man were to be the nominee of the Baltimore convention then it must be a "northern man with southern principles." It pronounced Walker's famous letter a complete refutation of every argument that had been advanced by Clay and Van Buren against annexation.[23]

More significant so far as the fortunes of the rival candidates for the democratic nomination were concerned was the manifesto put forth by the Mississippi delegation issued from Washington in May, 1844. This address to the democratic party of Mississippi was signed by the seven delegates chosen to represent that state at Baltimore; two of these were Robert J. Walker and Jacob Thompson; the former had been in the senate since 1835, and the latter had been a member of the house since 1839. This declaration spoke in no uncertain tone. It dwelt upon the fact that those who composed the convention that selected the delegates to the nominating convention had united in a subsequent meeting in favor of *immediate* annexation; that the legislature later, composed largely of members of the state convention, had declared that subject to be of paramount importance; furthermore the democratic press of the state was unanimous upon the subject, while the same measure was supported by very many whigs. Why any deference should have been accorded the attitude of the whigs as a reason for breaking their instructions was not disclosed. The address then proceeded to declare that no one opposed to this measure would receive the support of the democracy of Mississippi—a partially true statement. Then followed what had been said a hundred times over during the months preceding the active campaign, that the "re-annexation of Texas was not a sectional question; for while it would afford peace and security to the South, to the North and West it would give new and ever augmenting markets." The paper closed with this significant statement: "Only those who sustain this great and truly American measure shall receive our cordial and undoubted support." Besides the names of Walker and Thompson, the address bore the signatures of T. M. Tucker, R. W. Roberts, W. H. Hammett, W. Smith, and C. A. Bradford—all party leaders within their own state, and one, the most resource-

[23] *Vicksburg Sentinel and Expositor*, May 21, 1844.

ful and astute politician of his day.[24] It was not without misgiving that this bold stand was taken by the Mississippi delegation, and there can hardly be any doubt that the moving spirit in causing their instructions to be thrown to the winds was Robert J. Walker, the man who for eight years had been striving for the accomplishment of annexation. Three years before in writing to Van Buren about his financial losses, he had expressed his respect for the stainless purity and kindness which had invariably marked the ex-president's character as a man; now, as Benton puts it, he was the main-spring in all the movements against the former president.[25] Walker was zealously aided by "Jake" Thompson, as he was known in the parlance of the politicians, and by William M. Gwin, a leading figure in the political history of his state.

One of the members of the Mississippi delegation, writing long after the passions engendered by the campaign of 1844 had subsided, has this to say: "When Mr. Van Buren took ground adverse to the admission of Texas, it was after the convention of Mississippi had instructed the delegation in the Baltimore convention to support him for the nomination of President. My colleagues and myself, being delegates, at once determined to disobey instructions. I went to Mr. Walker and got him to join in an address to our constituents, advising them of our determination. We all knew that unless we could defeat Mr. Van Buren's nomination, this movement would prove our political defeat, and there were not a few at home who at first condemned our course. But it succeeded. Polk was nominated. Walker was put forth to do the speaking of our delegation in the convention: I became prominent only by my decisive course and firmness in keeping Mr. Walker from yielding to any compromise."[26] Though these words were written more than a generation after the events described, and after the two principal figures in the incident of the "lost commission" had become bitter enemies, there is no reason for doubting the substantial

[24] *Vicksburg Sentinel and Exposition*, May 21, 1844; *Mississippian*, May 22, 1844; *Mississippi Free Trader*, May 22, 1844. The address was dated May 5.

[25] Van Buren manuscripts, in library of congress. Cf. Thomas H. Benton, *Thirty years' view; or a history of the working of the American government for thirty years, from 1820 to 1850* (New York, 1856-1858), 2: 594.

[26] Claiborne correspondence.

accuracy of Thompson's statements. According to Thompson, his relations with Walker at this time were "most intimate." If we are to believe Thompson, no little part of the credit for Walker's famous letter on Texas annexation is due the former: ". . . in preparing it I was very often in his room: every part or paragraph was submitted to my criticism—and often my suggestion was taken."[27] Pillow and Bancroft each played his part in the nomination of Polk; it was into the mind of the latter, we are told, that the idea "flashed" of rallying upon the ex-governor of Tennessee. It is nevertheless true that "Mr. Robert J. Walker was the active manipulator of that memorable convention." By "renewing and vitalizing the rule of the democratic party whereby the candidate must secure two-thirds of all votes cast to receive the nomination," the "little senator" obtained complete control of that body. He had argued against the majority rule as enabling the delegates from hopeless whig states to overpower the really effective vote.[28]

To Van Buren's supporters the Egyptian Hall at Baltimore must have been anything but a pleasant abode during the last days of May. Writing under date of May 27, one of his followers expressed himself thus: "The very atmosphere is burthened with the putrid odor of corruption so rotten and rife in men's hearts." "Intrigue is so active and treachery so corrupt that nothing can be relied on, and you must be prepared for the worst. I see and hear a great deal that almost turns my stomach." At half-past five on the morning of May 28, J. R. Livingston wrote as follows: "I cannot describe to you the treachery, deceit and base conspiracy."[29]

Few tears were shed in Mississippi over the fall of Van Buren. Though a journal or two expressed the opinion that he had been done a grave injustice,[30] on the whole the democratic papers joyfully acclaimed the new leaders, Polk and Dallas. The *Free Trader* eulogized the unfortunate Van Buren, asserting that his

[27] Claiborne correspondence.

[28] Van Buren manuscripts, library of congress. Cf. Smith, *Annexation of Texas*, 251; William E. Dodd, *Expansion and conflict* (*Riverside history of the United States*, vol. 3 — Boston, [1915]), 129. According to Claiborne, Polk "owed his nomination more to Messrs. Walker, Gwin and Thompson, of Mississippi, than to any others in the Convention." *Mississippi as a province, territory and state*, 453.

[29] Van Buren manuscripts.

[30] *Columbus Democrat*, June 9, 1844.

name, with that of Jefferson and Jackson, would stand higher than all others, save that of Washington.[31] In a similar strain the *Holly Springs Guard* wrote: "We know of no man in the State who can dare arrogate to himself as much of the love and veneration of her people as Martin Van Buren."[32] But no condemnation was pronounced by a single editor upon the work of the Mississippi delegates in shelving the man who was now referred to in such an adulatory fashion. Whig sentiment found expression in a long article copied from the *Baltimore American* in the *Columbus Whig*. One sentence may be quoted as expressive of the whole: "He has fallen without dignity—fallen in the attitude of grasping eagerly at a prize which he thought was within his reach, but which was withdrawn from him with tantalizing contumely."[33]

An aggressive campaign was made in Mississippi on the part of the democrats, with the result that the Polk and Dallas electors were chosen by a majority of something over five thousand votes. At least twelve per cent of this represented a defection on the part of the whigs dissatisfied with the stand of their party on the annexation question.[34]

It was a foregone conclusion that Robert J. Walker would be a member of the new cabinet. He could easily have secured the endorsement of his state for the second place on the ticket but in a letter read to the convention assembled at Jackson on January 8, 1844, he declined to be a candidate for vice-president, the reason assigned being that his term in the senate did not expire until March 4, 1847, and as senator he could render the greatest service in furthering the cause of annexation. It is not difficult to believe that there were other reasons for Walker's declining to be sidetracked in this fashion, but reasons which it would not have been safe for him to avow at this stage.

It was in this same convention that Jefferson Davis spoke in terms of unstinted praise of John C. Calhoun, and of his advocacy of the annexation of Texas as being of vital importance to the south. Calhoun, Davis contended, could be depended upon

[31] *Mississippi Free Trader*, June 12, 1844.

[32] *Holly Springs Guard*, April 17, 1845.

[33] *Columbus Whig*, June 20, 1844.

[34] See maps in Arthur C. Cole, *The whig party in the south* (Washington, 1913), and in Dodd, *Expansion and conflict*.

to support this question with zeal and ability.[35] In striking contrast to the attacks made upon the different political leaders in the state at this time by partisan journals, Calhoun and Davis were uniformly spoken of in a courteous and complimentary manner by newspapers of all shades of political opinion. One of the leading whig organs referred to the great South Carolinian as "one of the brightest of America's jewels;"[36] the *Columbus Democrat* expressed the hope that Calhoun would remain in the cabinet, for he had ever proven himself a bulwark of defense for the south.[37] In connection with the Oregon question, which was linked up with the Texas program at the Baltimore convention,[38] the *Vicksburg Sentinel* declared there was "no man so admirably fashioned to conduct a negotiation of such vast magnitude and peculiar delicacy;" his conduct of the state department had more than ever identified him with the south, and this at a time when the moral and religious feeling of the world was being arrayed by scheming politicians against southern institutions.[39] The *Guard*, published at Holly Springs, the rallying-point of the democracy of north Mississippi, characterized the South Carolina statesman as "the great champion of the South and southern interests;" it solemnly affirmed the Oregon and Texas questions to be of deep and lasting moment to the south and west, upon the issue of which rested the perpetuity of southern domestic institutions.[40]

But Calhoun failed to be retained as secretary of state by the new administration. The *Southern Reformer*, one of the leading democratic organs in the state, protested against what it termed base and insidious attempts to prejudice Polk's administration against him; the *Port Gibson Herald* observed that "Calhounism has fought its last battle and been betrayed by those in whom it trusted."[41] Two years later the president was

[35] *Mississippi Free Trader*, January 24, 1844.

[36] *Vicksburg Weekly Whig*, November 11, 1845.

[37] *Columbus Democrat*, February 22, 1845.

[38] Cf. Clark E. Persinger, "The 'bargain of 1844' as the origin of the Wilmot proviso," in American historical association, *Annual report*, 1911 (Washington, 1913), 1: 189-195.

[39] *Vicksburg Sentinel*, April 22, 1844; January 20, 1845.

[40] *Holly Springs Guard*, February 14, March 27, 1844; *Columbus Democrat*, February 1, 1845. Cf. Reeves, *American diplomacy under Tyler and Polk*, 137.

[41] *Port Gibson Herald*, April 17, 1845.

recording in his diary some bitter comments in connection with the rumors that Calhoun had come out for General Taylor for president, even going so far as to denounce him as "wholly destitute of political principle"[42]—a most unwarranted charge, and evidently penned at a time when the president's mind was overwrought by idle rumors.

Claiborne's statement that Polk had given a voluntary pledge not to be a candidate for reëlection seems highly improbable,[43] otherwise why should Polk have been so sensitive about the succession? It is not surprising, however, that the president should have had misgivings about the ambitions of his secretary of the treasury. Under date of January 18, 1846, the president tells how Walker entered into a very solemn and earnest conversation in relation to his position in the administration; he alluded to the fact that he had political enemies among the democratic senators, but disavowed their apprehensions in regard to his being a candidate for the presidency. Walker assured the president that he would publish a letter to that effect if it were deemed necessary. To this Polk replied that he had received letters from his cabinet to that effect before their appointment. "He (i.e., Walker) said he was the object of violent attack and, with much agitation & feeling, said he would retire from the Cabinet the moment I was of opinion his remaining in it would embarrass the administration."[44] Walker was given to agitation, and, it would seem, should have become hardened to the assaults of his political enemies by this time. For ten years the democratic journals of Mississippi had been defending Walker against what they termed the "foul aspersions" cast upon both his public and private character by the "whig presses and scribblers." His unfortunate financial experiences offered a vulnerable side to the attacks of a partisan press, while his shrewd and successful political methods, resembling those of the modern boss, were the despair of the whig leaders. The following excerpt is from one of the leading whig organs: "Little Senator

[42] *The diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849, now first printed from the original manuscript in the collections of the Chicago historical society*, edited by Milo M. Quaife (Chicago, 1910), 2: 470.

[43] Claiborne, *Mississippi as a province, territory and state*, 452.

[44] *Diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849* (Quaife ed.), 1: 177.

Walker has gone away again to the inexpressible grief and mortification of the good people hereabouts. After remaining in the neighborhood for a few days, appearing occasionally to gladden the hearts of his loving subjects, the dear little man has again left us . . . Where he lives, we have not been able for the life of us to find out."[45]

In this connection it is interesting to recall that one of Walker's staunchest defenders during the campaign of 1844 was the *Free Trader*, which at this time was edited without remuneration by the distinguished Mississippian, Colonel John F. H. Claiborne. Claiborne later became very bitter toward Walker, a feeling which mars his sketch of Walker in his history, only exceeded in vindictiveness by his life of Poindexter in the same volume.[46] This prejudice against Walker seems to have been intensified while Claiborne was collecting material for his first volume, though the root of it is to be found in events which transpired years earlier. Claiborne felt, and with justice, that he had been badly treated by the party leaders of his own state; but if we are to believe William M. Gwin, from whose gossipy letters Claiborne derived no little information about their contemporaries, Walker had nothing directly to do with Claiborne's being "outlawed by the leaders of our own party after your failure to secure a re-election"—referring to the congressional campaign of 1837. In this same connection Gwin wrote: "The result you cannot have forgotten for it consigned you to private life instead of . . . a great public career . . . Thus I consider Foote did you a greater injury than any man dead or alive."[47] No one will regret that Claiborne was balked in his political aspirations, for Mississippi history would almost be as if it were not had not her foremost historian devoted his life to preserving the history of his native state. Much of his work was done "in declining health, in pain and suffering," and this

[45] *Weekly Courier and Journal*, August 16, 1843. This was a reference to the charge that Walker's domicile was in Louisiana. Cf. *Mississippi Free Trader*, May 1, October 23, 1844; *Mississippian*, July 5, November 6, 1844; *Port Gibson Herald*, April 17, 1845; *Columbus Democrat*, March 22, 1845.

[46] In another connection Gwin wrote to Claiborne: "I must express my regret that you consider it a duty you owe to yourself in writing the history of your native state, to place Mr. Walker in an unfavorable position before the people he so ably represented in the Senate and in the Cabinet." Claiborne correspondence.

[47] *Ibid.*

goes a long way toward atoning for the shortcomings in what was with him a labor of love.

Though the defects and failings in Walker's character are obvious, in some of his letters the man is revealed in a more pleasing light than it is customary to think of him. He was an indulgent father and, in the heyday of his prosperity, lavished his money upon the members of his family and household when traveling in state in Europe. Writing on one occasion to John A. Quitman, he refers to the deep affliction which had come upon him in the death of a sister to whom he was most devotedly attached, a loss which had for some time disqualified him for all business affairs. Though Calhoun's political opponent, he affected the very highest respect for the talents and integrity of that eminent statesman, extolling the latter quality as one all the more to be cherished since it was so rare, and one which should be deemed by the people an indispensable prerequisite of political preferment. Some of his letters to Claiborne, written in 1842, breathe a most friendly spirit: "You must write to me as fully as you would to a Brother and let me know all your wishes and prospects, and rest assurred you will have my head and heart both at work to accomplish whatever you may desire in this matter. In looking back from your boyhood to the present period we have always been friends. I am deeply your debtor for kindness and support in every emergency, and I am not ungrateful."[48] Walker belonged to a group of aggressive and not overscrupulous politicians, and was perhaps no better or no worse than a number of others who might be mentioned, though excelling them all in energy, in talents, and in resourcefulness. To one of Polk's straightforward nature, there were times when the actions of his able secretary occasioned serious perplexity of mind. Such an occasion was Walker's abrupt leaving for New York in order to negotiate a loan, which drew forth the following comment: "I cannot understand the necessity for all this secrecy and mystery in the movements of the Secretary . . . Why was his note without date and not delivered till noon to-day?"[49] Later when Walker's health was greatly impaired by his assiduous labors in connection with the duties of his office, the president expressed deep regret at his

[48] Claiborne correspondence.

[49] *Diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849* (Quaife ed.), 2: 166.

inability to perform the exacting requirements of his office, and spoke nothing but the simple truth when he characterized him as a "very able & indefatigable man."[50] On one occasion Walker was taken suddenly ill in the Treasury building, where he would stay for days and nights at a time working on his reports. Contemporaries have testified to his arduous labors in the performance of the duties of his office. One who knew him intimately spoke of him as follows: "With all his defects and failings he was a wonderfully great man. He was one of the few men I have met in my long career in active political life of that extensive information which caused me to look up to him as an authority. He was one of the best informed men I ever knew—a walking library." In another connection the same writer referred to Walker's great talents and wonderful acquirements. "He had every page of our history at his finger's end, and there are events in his public life that will place him in the front rank of American statesmen."[51]

Claiborne has related the circumstances under which Walker became secretary of the treasury.[52] His informant was Jacob Thompson, whose letter dealing with the subject is printed in his history, and which was written some thirty-three years after the events described. Since the phraseology of the printed letter differs as to details from the original, the latter is here reproduced: "When Polk was elected, Walker came to me and said he wished to become a member of his cabinet—he wanted my help. My relations with Pres. Polk prior to his election were good, I might say intimate. I promised Mr. Walker my zealous support and told him I must manage matters in my own way except that I would join the whole delegation in a general letter to the president . . . On the 3rd of March, 1845, Mr. Walker came to me and told me confidentially Pres[t] Polk had just informed him that the only thing he could do for him (Walker) was to give him the office of Attorney-General. I felt indignant and told Mr. Walker in plain terms that after we had made the fight for Secretary of State or Secretary of the Treasury, for him now to take the office of Attorney-General was to let him

[50] *Diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849* (Quaife ed.), 3: 10, 12, 18, 27, 96.

[51] Claiborne correspondence.

[52] Claiborne, *Mississippi as a province, territory and state*, 438, 439, 453.

down and was no better than defeat. He argued with me at great length that he had better take it than be defeated altogether. I told him I was surprised at his position and he would take it at my most earnest protest both to himself and the President. He requested me then to see the President, but not to decline for him the Attorney Generalship. I did see the President on the night of the 3rd and saw him alone. I told him as a friend I insisted that he should recast his cabinet—that he was about to do a heinous injustice to my friend, etc. He took his list while I was present, formed and reformed it, and finally put in Walker as Secretary of the Treasury, wrote in the other names and assured me so it would stand. I went to Mr. Walker that night, told him how matters stood and that the President had assured me he would not change it. He seized me by the hand, thanked me, and said your zeal and unwillingness to yield had saved him a mortification to which he had made up his mind to submit."[53]

Writing to Claiborne many years after this time, W. M. Gwin has this to say: "As to Polk's cabinet, there are three living witnesses that can certify for each other, who placed Buchanan, Marcy and Walker in the cabinet. These three are Simon Cameron, of Pennsylvania, Col. J. D. Stephenson, of San Francisco, colonel of a regiment sent to the coast during the Mexican war, and myself. Cameron got what he bargained for; so did Stephenson. I got nothing. Walker was already appointed Attorney-General, and Bancroft Secretary of the Treasury, when the combination was made that formed Polk's cabinet."[54]

Walker's appointment, whatever may have been the precise circumstances under which it was made, certainly could have occasioned no surprise to those in touch with the new administration. The Washington correspondent of the *Columbus Democrat,* writing under date of January 24, announced that Buchanan and Walker would be in the cabinet, the latter probably as secretary of state, "though he does not covet cabinet honors; will be Secretary of the Treasury, for here he can do most for the South in the way of tariff and public lands."[55] One whig

[53] Claiborne correspondence.

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] *Columbus Democrat,* February 8, 1845.

journal observed that so far as the cabinet was concerned, Pennsylvania and New York were the winners, for R. J. Walker was a Pennsylvanian by feeling as well as by birth, and had always been noted for his consistent opposition to Calhounism and nullification.[56]

Walker resigned from the senate on February 11. A few weeks later, on March 5, he was handed a sealed package by Dr. Tate, of Columbus, Mississippi, a local politician of some prominence. Tate was acting as the messenger of Governor A. G. Brown, then serving his second term, and was also the bearer of letters to Gwin and Thompson. As was later disclosed, the package contained a commission for Thompson as successor to Walker in the senate. In his letter to Walker, the governor explained that his tendered resignation was not *absolutely* accepted, but that he might withdraw it at any time up to March 10, in which event he was to destroy the commission for Thompson; otherwise Thompson was to serve the unexpired term of Walker, that is, till March 4, 1847, or "until he shall be superseded by an election by the Legislature." Thompson's appointment had been decided upon February 21, and was to be in force "from and after March 10."[57] As a matter of fact Walker did not resign, and Thompson according to his own account never had any inkling of the governor's intention until his return home. At the very time indeed when Thompson was exerting himself in Walker's behalf for a place in the cabinet, the latter had the commission in his pocket, but failed to make any mention of it to Thompson. To quote Thompson's own words: ". . . Governor Brown in the meantime wrote me and asked me if I thought Walker would get a place in the cabinet. I replied I thought he would succeed. Knowing that a session of the Senate would be called on March 5th, and wishing Mississippi to be represented in that session, he filled up a commission appointing me Senator to fill the vacancy made by Robt. J. Walker, leaving the date only blank. This he forwarded to Mr. Walker . . . When I returned home in March, 1845, I found myself unanimously nominated for Congress, and immediately I accepted the nomination. Then it was Governor Brown

[56] *Port Gibson Herald,* April 17, 1845.

[57] Executive journal, manuscript in state archives of Mississippi.

invited me to meet him in Grenada. I did so. He told me how he had issued the commission — that Dr. Gwin had strongly urged him to appoint him; that Walker was in favor of Gwin's appointment, that he had declined to do so, and was surprised that Walker had not delivered the senatorial commission to me, and he then wished me to accept it. Gwin, he said would be a candidate for the Senate, Quitman, Foote and some [word illegible]. I told him had the commission come into my hands while at Washington, I should have accepted, and thanked him — but now I had accepted the nomination of the Convention and I would not embarrass the party by forcing them to make a new nomination. At my suggestion he then and there appointed Judge Chalmers.

"At that time Dr. Gwin had felt himself greatly aggrieved with me because I had opposed and defeated a bill in which he was deeply interested which on its face purported to be for the relief of the Chickasaw Indians. This led to a serious controversy between Gwin and myself which terminated in Gwin sending me a challenge. I called in Quitman and Jeff Davis as my friends, and they adjusted the matter without a meeting. The result to both Walker and Gwin of this controversy was that I was returned to Congress by the largest popular majority ever received by any man in the State up to that time. I never spoke to Walker or Gwin until I was a member of Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet — that is we never spoke from 1845 to 1861, and then for a while only on official business."[58]

With this recital of the circumstances connected with the lost commission may be compared two contemporary accounts of the same affair by Thompson. One of these is his letter to Governor Brown declining the appointment of senator; and the other written nearly five months later is an address to the people of Mississippi upon the same subject. The letter was written from Oxford, his home, and bears date of April 12, a letter from Governor Brown and a duplicate commission having been received the day previous. In this the writer says: "Had the commis-

[58] Claiborne correspondence. Mrs. Rosa B. Tyler, of Holly Springs, a daughter of Roger Barton, has informed the writer that the unexpired term was offered her father. "My father declined on the score of a delicate wife who could hardly assume the responsibility of a family in his absence. But he added: 'Appoint my friend Chalmers, and I will esteem it a favor to me.'"

sion reached me while in Washington, I should have accepted the honor and entered upon the discharge of its duties." But after the adjournment of the senate the high trust confided to him would have been laid down. For to retain the position he must become a candidate before the ensuing legislature — a thing which might be provocative of party division, and which might imperil the unity and success of the party; he therefore welcomes self-effacement, if that will leave the party free and untrammeled in the choice of a candidate.[59]

The address published in the following September has a different tone, and is in the nature of a whitewash of Walker's conduct in suppressing the commission; it is thus seen that it expressed anything but the real feelings of the writer. In this he states that he cannot believe Walker was influenced by any motive or consideration of a personal nature, inasmuch as he had supported the secretary of the treasury in his aspirations for a cabinet position. Walker evidently misunderstood the wishes and feelings of Governor Brown in the matter. Thompson assures the public that at no time had he felt one moment's mortification at the course of events. In conclusion Thompson tells his constituents that he would never have accepted the commission had Walker intimated he had one![60] The address thus constitutes a flat contradiction of the sentiments of Thompson as set forth in his letters to Claiborne and to Governor Brown. What is the explanation of this inconsistency? Evidently his chief concern was to avoid saying anything that might be construed as a reflection upon Walker; it was eminently desirable to keep on good terms with the head of the treasury department who had control of a considerable amount of patronage. Walker was a politician whose enmity was not lightly to be incurred. On the other hand it is perfectly clear that Thompson nursed a deep resentment against Walker — a resentment that manifested itself in indirect attacks upon that individual during the following summer.

Long before the appearance of this address, the story of the suppressed commission had become noised about, and a bitter newspaper war of crimination and recrimination ensued. It was

[59] *Columbus Democrat*, May 3, 1845.

[60] *Ibid.*, September 27, 1845.

nothing new for the whig journals to denounce Walker and his methods, but now a considerable portion of the democratic press within the state joined in the attack. The most violent and persistent of these was the *Vicksburg Sentinel*, the organ of McNutt, who, with Quitman, Gwin, and Foote were rivals for Walker's seat in the senate. The *Sentinel* called upon Polk to dismiss Walker from the cabinet. The *Vicksburg Whig* characterized Walker's conduct in withholding the commission as a flagrant outrage upon public justice, an insult to the state without parallel. The same journal protested that he would never rest satisfied until he was secretary of state and would break up the cabinet in order to attain his object.[61] Among the more prominent journals which undertook the defense of Walker were the *Southern Reformer*, the *Mississippian*, and the *Columbus Democrat*. The last named journal commended Governor Brown for what it termed his independence in appointing a successor to Senator Walker.[62] The *Holly Springs Guard* approved of Thompson's appointment, though it favored the claims of the "old war horse of Democracy," Roger Barton.[63] Barton had been one of the candidates to succeed Henderson, a whig senator, "who had displayed Roman firmness and patriotism upon the Texas question." Reluctance to choose a man from the northern part of the state, however, had led to the choice of General Speight.

During all the newspaper controversy upon the subject of the lost commission, Walker had maintained silence. Finally on June 16 he issued a statement from Washington justifying his course of action. In this he proceeded to tell how on March 5 he had received a confidential communication and the commission for Jacob Thompson, the latter to take effect five days later. It seems that the governor had been induced to make this appointment "in consequence of assurances from me, that my own vote, or that of my successor, might, in all probability, would be necessary, to give the Democratic party a majority in the Senate upon the election of a printer for two years at the executive session." The resignation had left twenty-four whigs and an equal

61 *Vicksburg Whig*, April 7, June 18, 1845.
62 *Columbus Democrat*, March 29, April 5, May 17, 1845.
63 *Holly Springs Guard*, April 10, 1845.

number of democrats in the senate, exclusive of the vote of the presiding officer. In the opinion of Walker a full discretion had been given him by Governor Brown to deliver the commission or not. Since the contingency anticipated by Walker had not arisen — the senate having determined not to go into the election of a printer — the delivery of the commission under such circumstances would, according to him, have violated the will and purpose of the executive and the "confidential trust and discretion developed by him to me." It was clear, argued Walker, that if the governor had been present he would not have delivered the commission until the contingency had happened; it was the property of the governor and not of the person named until its delivery to him. This recalls the well-known case of Marbury *v.* Madison, with which Walker was certainly perfectly familiar, though he could have argued the circumstances in the two instances were not the same. Finally it is stated that there was no hostility between Thompson and himself: "no man exerted himself more warmly and efficiently . . . to place me in my present position as secretary of the treasury."[64]

It is thus seen that Walker's defense of his action in withholding the commission turned upon the fact that the instructions imposed upon him by Governor Brown prevented him from acting in the premises, which instructions had resulted only from the assurances made by him to the executive as to the great importance attaching to the election of a printer. In this stand he was supported by the *Columbus Democrat*, which, among other journals, argued that inasmuch as the contingency referred to had not arisen, Walker was not called upon to assume any responsibility in the matter; it expressed doubt, however, as to the legality of an appointment made in this manner.[65] It now became incumbent upon Governor Brown to state his side of the case, for at a meeting of the members of his own party in Madison county he was called upon to explain the facts to the public. Accordingly on June 23 the governor issued a brief statement from the executive mansion in Jackson, the purport of which was that he had instructed Walker that his resignation was not absolutely accepted, but that it might be withdrawn at

[64] *Holly Springs Guard*, July 17, 1845.
[65] *Columbus Democrat*, May 17, 1845.

any time up to March 10; that the appointment had been hastily made in anticipation of the emergency, arising at the executive session; he furthermore admitted that his appointment of Thompson was due to his reluctance to interfere in a controversy between friends.[66]

The publication of the letters of Walker and Brown was the signal for a bitter expression of protest on the part of the whig journals, and of a not inconsiderable number of democratic papers within the state. The *Port Gibson Herald* referred to the high-handed act of a notorious demagogue in retaining in his possession the credentials of Thompson.[67] The *Vicksburg Whig* characterized Walker's statement as "a contemptible attempt at quibbling," his real object being to defeat the choice of Gale and Seaton as public printers.[68] By the *Panola Lynx* the incident of the lost commission was cited as an instance of "one of the strongest characteristics of Mississippi democracy—recklessness in political morals." Behind Thompson's smooth words it discerned between the lines of his address his true feelings in the matter—that he considered the suppression of the commission as an outrage upon the people of Mississippi and as utterly unjustifiable and inexcusable on the part of Walker. It attributed his soreness, however, to the fact that he had not been admitted to a share in the speculations in which others were engaged; hence the "holy shudders which 'Jake' was having at the 'enormities' which Walker and Gwin were attempting to perpetrate," since the two latter, it was well known, were itching for the rich attorneys' fees in connection with the Chickasaw claims.[69] Governor Brown's card, in the opinion of the *Raymond Gazette*, was an admission that the appointment was bad since his action, according to his own statement, was due to his reluctance to interfere in a controversy between friends; as a matter of fact no real vacancy had existed, since Walker's resignation was not absolutely accepted.[70] No journal was so persistent and so vicious in its assaults upon Walker as the *Vicksburg Sentinel*, which declared that his appointment to the post

[66] *Columbus Democrat*, July 5, 1845.
[67] *Port Gibson Herald*, June 19, 1845.
[68] *Vicksburg Whig*, July 12, 1845.
[69] *Panola Lynx*, July 19, September 13, 1845.
[70] *Raymond Gazette*, July 4, 1845.

of secretary of the treasury shocked all sense of propriety and was an injurious scandal to the national name on account of the incumbent's bad fame regarding his pecuniary transactions, and on account of his having openly advocated repudiation of his state's debts. As to the suppressed commission, the transaction wore an aspect of the most barefaced usurpation, if not corruption. Walker was charged with having directed Governor Brown to appoint Gwin as his successor, and with suppressing Brown's private letter to Thompson. At Washington it had been spoken of as a fixed thing that Gwin would go into the senate in Walker's place. The truth of the matter was that the Chickasaw bill, which had been defeated through Thompson's efforts, was at the bottom of the whole affair. The *Sentinel* called upon President Polk at once to dismiss Walker from his cabinet. In its issues of September 12 and 17, it asked Governor Brown to publish the letters between himself and Walker. To this the governor replied as follows: "You ask me to say whether I will communicate the whole correspondence to the Legislature. Mr. Walker's letter and all other papers and correspondence of a public character in the Executive office will be submitted to the Legislature or any body else whenever a desire is expressed to see them. What I would do should the Legislature demand of me private and confidential letters to me by Mr. Walker or anybody else, it is now unnecessary to determine."[71] The issue, declared the *Sentinel*, was reduced to one of fact: Walker's contention was that he was authorized to suppress the commission if no election for printer took place; while Governor Brown had said he was authorized to suppress it, if he did not resign.[72]

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that the assaults of such journals as the *Sentinel* upon Walker were due primarily to zeal for the public welfare; violent abuse was a characteristic weapon of factional politics of that day even as it is of our own. It was this same journal that, edited by one Hagan, had done its utmost a few years before to hound Prentiss from the state.

The only reference to the lost commission by Gwin that has been noticed in the Claiborne correspondence is the following: "In regard to the lost commission we might differ very mate-

[71] *Vicksburg Sentinel*, June 6, 19, July 4, 18, 21, 25, August 11, 13, 15, September 12, 17, 23, 1845.

[72] *Ibid.*, October 20, 1845.

rially in the facts as well as inferences. They (i.e. Thompson and Brown) can compare notes and agree while I know nothing of what they think or may say. I know both were on very friendly terms with Walker after that event, and I doubt the propriety of striking him now. As to my action in the matter I have no regrets nor have I now any concealments. Strange to say the subject was never alluded to between Thompson and myself during Buchanan's administration, and afterwards in Europe we were perfectly confidential with each other on all matters." At this time Gwin was far from being on the best of terms with the party leaders in his own state, while like Walker he was cordially despised by the whigs. His subsequent relations with Governor Brown are referred to in a pointed manner: being assailed by Brown after Gwin's election as senator from California, "I struck him in the face the hardest blow I could with pen and ink . . . for years we were in the Senate without any personal intercourse or allusion to each other in debate."[73] It will be noted that what Gwin has to say about the relations of Walker and Thompson subsequent to 1845 is refuted by Thompson's statement quoted above. "I could never tolerate Walker," Thompson wrote Claiborne years later.[74]

This bitterness entertained toward Walker by Thompson led to an attempt by the latter to defeat the nomination of Dr. James H. Tate as consul to Buenos Ayres. Tate, it will be recalled, was the intermediary between Governor Brown and Walker at the time of the latter's contemplated resignation from the senate. Tate had been appointed by President Polk during a recess of the senate, and had left for his post of duty some time during the summer or fall of the first year of the new administration.[75] In December Polk was called upon by Thompson, who insisted upon the president's withdrawing the nomination of Tate; Thompson "insisted that he had . . . been guilty of duplicity in his intercourse with him." Receiving no assurances from the president that his request would be complied with, "he left apparently disappointed, and I judged from his manner & con-

[73] Claiborne correspondence. On September 11, 1850, Brown, then in the senate, made an attack upon Gwin's claim.

[74] *Ibid.* Cf. Claiborne, *Mississippi as a province, territory and state*, 439.

[75] *Diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849* (Quaife ed.), 1: 166.

versation was much dissatisfied." A few days later the two Mississippi senators, Chalmers and Speight, called at the White House to consult the president in regard to Tate's nomination; Speight advised strongly against its withdrawal, pointing out that Thompson had been one of those who had recommended Tate.[76] About the middle of January Polk was visited by Walker, who suggested the withdrawal of Tate's nomination; this suggestion the president carried out. This action was taken on account of the secretary of the treasury's having represented that Tate's good faith had been assailed by Thompson before the senate or in the presence of individual senators, and he thought unless the charges were refuted by Tate, he would be rejected by the senate.[77] The day following the president records in his diary how he was called on by Senator Haywood, of North Carolina, who told him the Mississippi senators were "mistaken friends and bad counsellors, and had not treated me well." They informed the president that on the day previous to the withdrawal of the nomination a resolution had been offered in executive session, calling upon Walker to answer the charges made by Thompson to the senate against Tate; that the withdrawal "would have the appearance of my having done so to screen & save my Secretary of the Treasury." The president expressed surprise at the pendency of such a resolution touching Walker, and wrote, "I was deeply mortified that I had been placed in so false a position before the Senate."[78] Upon Sunday, January 18, Walker appeared with a letter signed by the two Mississippi senators containing their justification for advising the withdrawal of the nomination; their explanation was as follows: "It had not occurred to us that there was a resolution pending to call upon the Hon. R. J. Walker for further testimony in this matter, nor had we stated this to any one out of the Senate."[79] Walker likewise expressed surprise at the existence of such a resolution; he moreover assured the president there was

[76] *Diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849* (Quaife ed.), 1: 127, 132.

[77] *Ibid.*, 2: 166.

[78] *Ibid.*, 1: 168.

[79] From the *Executive journal* of the senate it appears that Tate's nomination was recommitted to the committee on commerce, which committee was instructed to transmit the communication of Thompson respecting the nominee to the secretary of the treasury "in order to afford that officer an opportunity to answer or explain such parts of the same as he may be desirous to do."

nothing in his conduct nor that of Tate to censure.[80] The upshot of the matter was that Tate, returning about this time, was renominated. Walker read to the president and Marcy a letter addressed to the committee of commerce to which had been referred Tate's nomination, containing an answer to Thompson's charges assailing Walker. "Mr. Walker's answer is a full & triumphant vindication of himself and Dr. Tate." He moreover showed the president the correspondence between himself and Tate during the previous summer, which placed Thompson in a "very awkward light." "Mr. Thompson's conduct in the affair was vindictive and without excuse."[81]

The entire incident affords a singular commentary upon Thompson's address quoted above, and is also interesting as showing how, as in the matter of Walker's position in the cabinet, he succeeded in reassuring the president of the integrity of his intentions and conduct.

It will be recalled that the reasons assigned by Thompson for Walker's suppressing the senatorial commission were due to the latter's chagrin at his failure to secure the appointment of W. M. Gwin as his successor. Reference has also been made to the fact that a bitter enmity existed between Thompson and Gwin on account of the former's having brought about the defeat of a bill having to do with certain claims of the Chickasaw Indians, the passage of which was being pressed by Gwin and Walker. Gwin denied that Walker had any interest in the Chickasaw land claims,[82] while Gwin's connection with these claims is not alluded to by Claiborne in his sketch of Gwin in his history. Years later when Claiborne was gathering material for these biographical sketches, Gwin wrote him as follows: "In 1850 I made an elaborate report of my connection with the Chickasaw tribe of Indians, and although Thompson was then in Congress and my enemy, the House exonerated me from all blame . . . all these Indian matters were personal controversies involving no political principle and the interest they excited died out in the generation in which they occurred."[83] It is hardly a matter of

[80] *Diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849* (Quaife ed.), 1: 175-177.

[81] *Ibid.*, 1: 179, 239.

[82] *Vicksburg Weekly Whig*, July 30, 1845.

[83] Claiborne correspondence. For Gwin's report, see *Congressional globe*, 31 congress, 1 session, appendix, 22: pt. 2, 1224-1234.

surprise that the interest excited by the question of the Indian claims should have died out; having obtained possession of the vast tracts once held by the Choctaw and the Chickasaw and turned them into cotton-growing plantations, the planters and the political leaders of their respective sections devoted all their energies to defending and extending the social and industrial institutions upon which rested the prosperity and political influence of the south.

The story of Gwin's connection with the Choctaw and Chickasaw claims is a long and involved one, and one that it is difficult to summarize without going into details beyond the scope of this paper. During the decade previous to the administration of Polk the names of some of the leading members of the democratic party in Mississippi were involved in frauds arising out of the speculations that ensued as a consequence of the opening up for settlement of the vast and fertile holdings of the Indians.[84] In 1835 Hiram G. Runnels and F. E. Plummer were engaged in a bitter and unseemly controversy in connection with the land sales at Chocchuma in 1833.[85] "Nowhere," says a recent writer, "was the spirit to despoil the natives more rampant than in Mississippi."[86] The lands of the Choctaw had been ceded in 1830 by the famous treaty of Dancing Rabbit—a treaty "simply made by intimidation and coercion."[87] The "history of the third Choctaw cession from the beginning of the negotiations at Dancing Rabbit Creek to the final execution of the treaty there made is characterized by violence, intimidation and fraud on the part of the white people."[88] So notorious were the frauds which arose in connection with the sales of these lands that a senate committee was appointed to investigate them: two of the five whig members were Poindexter and Prentiss; the former's influence was now rapidly on the wane; Prentiss clashed fiercely

[84] Among the lists of purchasers of land at Columbus and Chocchuma in 1833 and 1834 the name of R. J. Walker occurs nearly five hundred and fifty times. See *American state papers: public lands*, 7: 377-447. For Walker's defense against the charges brought against him, see *ibid.*, 8: 711-788.

[85] *Columbus Democratic Press*, September 25, 1835.

[86] See William E. Dodd, *Robert J. Walker, imperialist* ([Chicago], 1914).

[87] Cf. Halbert, "Story of the treaty of Dancing Rabbit," in Mississippi historical society, *Publications*, 6: 373-402.

[88] The most complete account of this affair is that by F. L. Riley, "Choctaw land claims," in *ibid.*, 8: 345-395.

some years later with John F. H. Claiborne at the time of the latter's fearless probing of the scandals associated with the Choctaw claims.[89] According to Claiborne William M. Gwin was a member of the company of speculators interested in the lands in the Yazoo valley; the receiver of the land office deposed that Gwin "appeared to be active in all the operations going on among those speculating in lands."[90] More than a decade later, those journals friendly to McNutt in his canvass for the senate were using against Gwin "his supposed Choctaw speculations."[91] The *Vicksburg Sentinel* mentioned Gwin as interested in those speculations which the legislature characterized as "profligate and infamous."[92]

It is in connection with the Chickasaw tribe, however, that we find Gwin's name frequently occurring in connection with a claim for services rendered that nation; this claim was persistently pressed by him during a period of several years. By the treaties of 1832 and 1834 the Chickasaw had ceded some seven millions of acres in Mississippi and Alabama to the United States. By the third article of the treaty of October 20, 1832, the United States "agreed to pay over to the Chickasaw nation all the money arising from the sale of land which may be received from time to time, after deducting therefrom the whole cost and expense of surveying and selling the land, including every expense attending the same." Another article of the same treaty provided for the laying out of the funds derived from the sale of their lands in "safe and valuable stocks" for the use and benefit of the Chickasaw nation. A large amount of this purchase money was invested in the stocks of several states; by 1844 arrears of interest amounting to several millions of dollars had accrued.[93] In 1837 the commissioner of Indian affairs despatched an agent to Cincinnati to purchase provisions and other things for the use of the Chickasaw; the sum of $144,000 was expended for this purpose. The Indians alleged that they received benefits to the extent of only $32,000, and refused to be charged with the re-

[89] Mississippi historical society, Publications, 8: 345-395; see also *Vicksburg Sentinel* for the years 1842 and 1844.

[90] *American state papers: public lands*, 7: 506; see also *Senate documents*, 28 congress, 1 session, 3: no. 168.

[91] *Panola Lynx*, August 2, 1845.

[92] *Vicksburg Sentinel*, April 29, 1845.

[93] *Senate documents*, 28 congress, 2 session, 2: no. 49.

maining $112,000.[94] In 1844 Dr. Gwin was empowered by a portion of the Chickasaw to conduct certain fiscal operations on their behalf with the United States government. The first contract with the Indians seems to have been rescinded; the second, it was charged, bore no date. On September 8, 1846, the second auditor of the treasury certified there was due William M. Gwin the sum of $56,021.49, this being one-half of the amount due the Indians for the purchase of provisions at Cincinnati in 1837. Another charge upon the Chickasaw fund, an itemized statement of which was printed by the government, was the sum of $5,160.15, this being one-half of what was said to be due Gwin on account of lands sold at Chocchuma and Columbus.[95] On September 9, 1846, Gwin transferred his interest in the larger claim to Corcoran and Riggs, of Washington, D. C. On March 12, 1850, this firm receipted for a requisition on the treasury for the amount of the claim.

It was in this same year that the department of the interior under Secretary Ewing was made the subject of a prolonged congressional investigation. A majority of a committee appointed by the house under a resolution bearing date of April 22, 1850, put itself upon record as follows: "Resolved, 'That the sum of $56,021.49, paid to Messrs. Corcoran and Riggs, as assignees of William M. Gwin, was justly due the Chickasaw Indians, and was improperly paid to Corcoran and Riggs.'"[96] This opinion was based in part upon the fact that the king of the Chickasaw affirmed that Gwin's contract or power of attorney had never been signed by him; upon a deposition of a member of the tribe that the power of attorney was signed after the resignation of the commissioners; the second contract, it was furthermore alleged, bore no date; and upon the fact that Marcy and William Medill, the commissioner of Indian affairs, had refused to sanction the claim.[97]

Further light is thrown upon the history of this claim by certain interesting references to it in President Polk's diary. In September, 1846, the matter was brought to his attention by a clerk in the treasury department. "He informed me that Doc-

[94] *Congressional globe*, 31 congress, 1 session, appendix, 22: pt. 2, 1282.
[95] *Executive documents*, 29 congress, 2 session, 4: no. 94.
[96] *Congressional globe*, 31 congress, 1 session, appendix, 22: pt. 2, 1220, ff.
[97] *Ibid.*

tor Gwin was the agent possessing this claim, and he was now in Washington pressing it; . . . Mr. Cutts (the clerk) said it was a claim improperly allowed." The president's attention was called to the fact that the claim had been before congress during the session of 1844-1845, it being defeated at that time by Cave Johnson; a report was made in favor of the claim at the same time, however, by R. J. Walker.[98] Not only, it was pointed out, had the accounting officers in Tyler's administration refused to sanction the claim; a long session of congress had intervened without that body taking any action in the matter, though of course the inaction of congress in the matter did not of itself imply condemnation of the lawfulness of the claim. The president thereupon sent for the secretary of war, who made known that he had just had a discussion with Dr. Gwin about the claim and had refused to sign a requisition for the money; he did not know how such a claim could have passed the accounting offices of the treasury. "He alluded to the opinion of the secretary of the Treasury that the claim ought to be paid, as the cause of his embarrassment in acting upon it." The day following the president recorded in his diary that the secretary of war had examined anew the claim of Dr. William M. Gwin upon the Chickasaw Indian fund, and found it to be "a much worse case than he had supposed it was on yesterday." Polk's conclusion as to the whole affair was that it was "a singular transaction."[99]

In Claiborne's sketch of Gwin in his history the matter of the Indian claims is not alluded to: this may be accounted for by the fact that Claiborne took Gwin's view of the claims as being merely of transient interest; perhaps he may have been influenced in part by the desire of Gwin that he should appear at his best when the history of his life came to be put in print. The two men were life-long friends, and Claiborne's book owes not a little of its interest to the information so plentifully supplied him by Gwin about the contemporaries of the two men. It is only fair to add that Gwin made an elaborate defense of the validity of his claim. Into the facts and the law set forth therein it has not been deemed necessary to go. Moreover, a minority report of the select committee referred to above, upheld his

[98] *Congressional globe*, 28 congress, 2 session, 394.

[99] *Diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849* (Quaife ed.), 2: 126, 127, 129.

claim, and declared there was "abundant evidence . . . proving the existence and contents of the contract between the Chickasaw nation and Dr. Gwin." At the instance of Secretary Ewing the attorney-general, Reverdy Johnson, twice pronounced the claim valid.[100]

In 1850 Thompson was acting as attorney for the Chickasaw nation; and as he made no objection to the report of the committee exonerating Gwin, the latter considered Thompson to have thereby verified his claim;[101] he also dwelt upon the fact that he and Thompson were the best of friends when the latter was a member of Buchanan's cabinet. As a matter of fact Gwin's chief grievance against Thompson seems to have been due to the fact that the latter had procured the defeat of a bill removing from the state courts to the federal jurisdiction at Washington claims involving the Chickasaw nation.[102] Thompson had also incurred the enmity of those concerned in the Choctaw claims, in which the speaker of the house was said to be interested. But it is unnecessary to pursue the subject any further. Though no political consequences ensued by reason of Thompson's failure to succeed Walker in the senate, the incident of the lost commission is strikingly characteristic of Mississippi politics at this period, when business integrity and political morality seem to have suffered severely from the riot of extravagance and speculation that marked the years preceding the era of repudiation.

It only remains to notice briefly a few things of interest in the subsequent careers of the principals in the lost commission. Both Thompson and Brown became conspicuous leaders in the struggle for "southern rights," and staunch supporters of southern interests in the decade following the compromise of 1850. Gwin later represented California in the senate and, as an advocate of vast railroad schemes, he was instrumental in securing millions in the way of appropriations for the west and the Pacific coast. Walker's later career is a story of waning influence in his own party, while failing to gain completely the influence of the antislavery men. According to Gwin, he was

[100] *Congressional globe*, 31 congress, 1 session, appendix, 22: pt. 2, 1224-1234.
[101] *Ibid.*, 31 congress, 1 session, appendix, 22: pt. 2, 1229.
[102] *Ibid.*, 28 congress, 2 session, 245.

strongly pressed for secretary of state in Buchanan's administration, a majority of democratic senators signing an application in his favor, but "old Buck" was induced to select General Cass. As compensation, however, Walker was persuaded by Buchanan to accept the governorship of Kansas on the ground that a man of his eminent talents and antecedents would be able to settle the Kansas question in a way that would inevitably make him president in 1860. Gwin begged him not to be deluded by any such anticipations, that the place was below his position in the party, and his acceptance would mortify his best friends. "His good wife joined me in this appeal but all to no effect. He was thoroughly imbued with the belief that he could settle the question successfully, and would be elected President upon his success and would win by acclamation. He came back Buchanan's bitter enemy and with the determination to make fierce war upon him personally." Knowing that he wanted to be dissuaded from such a course, by degrees Gwin got him to meet the president, "when they hugged and kissed and made up."[103] This incident suggests a similar scene of reconciliation enacted nearly a quarter of a century before in the Parker hotel at Natchez when Walker was as yet unknown to political fame, and when he has been represented as being in "terrible agony" at the thought of his political prospects being blighted on account of his having flinched on the question of the removal of the deposits. On this occasion he is said to have acted like a child saying that General Jackson would never forgive him. Judge Adams and Gwin reassured him, and, as is well known, obtained from Donelson the letter in which the Old Hero bestowed the needed vindication upon the man who was destined to play such a prominent role in the history of his state and country.

James E. Winston

University of Mississippi
University

[103] Claiborne correspondence. For a somewhat different version of the affair, see James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the compromise of 1850* (New York, 1895), 2: 272.

HISTORICAL ACTIVITIES IN CANADA, 1917-1918

As the war continues to absorb more and more of the national energies, historical activities in Canada, as elsewhere, undergo a corresponding contraction. This decline in all the normal fields of historical work is more noticeable during the year from July, 1917, to July, 1918, covered by the present survey, than in any previous similar period. The abnormal historical activities resulting from the war itself are, on the other hand, beginning to assume very considerable proportions.

THE WAR

The Canadian war record office, established in London under the direction of Colonel Lord Beaverbrook, to which reference was made in last year's survey, is performing services of great importance both to the contemporary and to the future historian. It prepares, collects, and preserves records of value for the narrative history of the Canadian forces serving in the field. These records include clippings from all the more important British newspapers referring to the doings of the Canadian troops; books and pamphlets bearing on Canada's part in the war or relating in any way to the Canadian forces; the official gazettes of Canada, the United Kingdom, and France; publications — such as trench papers — of Canadian regiments and other military organizations; official communiqués and the despatches of the accredited press correspondents regarding the Canadians and their services at the front; replicas of the badges of all Canadian units, and of the regimental colors; reports on the history of the formation and organization of each unit of the Canadian expeditionary force, prepared in each case by the officer in charge; records of such units which, having historical value, but no longer being required in routine service, are deposited in the office; general and routine orders of all departments and units of the Canadian expeditionary force; lists of honors and awards granted to Canadians, with statements of the services for which

each was granted, and photographs of the recipients; maps of all areas and of all actions in which Canadians have served; and the war diaries of all Canadian military units. The "contemporary history" series of files in the office contains records of the greatest importance, including summaries of operations, narratives of events, communiqués, secret reports, operation orders, and military maps, besides much miscellaneous material. There are also files of secret returns, secret aeroplane photographs, and secret panoramic photographs which, although they cannot at present be used, will in the future undoubtedly prove to be exceedingly valuable. The office devotes particular attention to obtaining personal narratives regarding events at the front from participants who were in a position to have accurate knowledge regarding important but otherwise obscure incidents.

The photographic section is preparing a complete photographic record of the Canadians in the field, and has obtained many excellent films of the troops in action. Sketches and paintings of scenes historically important are also being prepared. The publicity work of the office consists of exhibitions of official photographs, and the publication of a daily newspaper for the soldiers and of other periodicals giving news from the front.

The war archives survey, the formation of which, under the direction of Lieutenant-Colonel A. G. Doughty, public archivist, was mentioned in last year's survey, is continuing its work. A special mission composed of Lieutenant-Colonel Doughty, Lieutenant-Colonel Wood, well known for his writings on Canadian military history, and Major Gustave Lanctot, of the public archives staff and now of the Canadian military forces, visited Europe and gathered full reports on the organization and records of all Canada's overseas war activities. These reports are deposited in the public archives at Ottawa and will be of the highest value, both to the historian who may wish to get a comprehensive view of Canada's military organization, and to the archivist who, hereafter, shall have the duty of classifying and arranging the war records. A similar survey of war activities in Canada is in progress.

Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank, who has been attached for historical work to the headquarters staff of the department of militia and defense, and is a member of the war archives sur-

vey, has been engaged in examining the records of the militia department for the purposes of that survey.

Measures have been taken by the British government to provide for the establishment in London of an imperial war museum, with a Canadian section and a Canadian representative on the committee of administration. It will contain captured war trophies, and all kinds of war souvenirs, as posters, pictures, war stamps, photographs, pamphlets, handbills, badges, war equipment of all varieties and the machinery used in its manufacture. Since 1916 the public archivist, who also holds the distinct office of director of war trophies, has been gathering a similar collection for Canada itself. The main collection has recently been on exhibition in the United States for the benefit of the Red Cross, but a very large addition thereto, obtained by Lord Beaverbrook, has just arrived in Canada.

Certain provincial archives departments — notably that of British Columbia — and various local historical societies are taking measures to secure a full permanent record of the services in the great struggle, of troops from their provinces or localities.

The fourth supplement of *Proclamations, orders in council and documents relating to the European war* has been issued by the department of the secretary of state of Canada, and brings this valuable compilation down to October 1, 1916.

Short and more or less ephemeral articles on Canada's share in the war are becoming very numerous. Some of the more important of these will be indicated in the section devoted to periodical literature. Larger and more permanent studies are as yet comparatively few. Lord Beaverbrook, whose facilities for compiling a contemporary history of the struggle are unique in the annals of warfare, is understood to have the third volume of his *Canada in Flanders* ready for publication, and to be at work on a fourth. Each will be issued, doubtless, as soon as the military authorities permit its release. The publishers of the well known *Makers of Canada* series of historical biographies are preparing a coöperative history, *Canada in the great world war*, which, it is expected, will consist of six volumes. The first volume has appeared, but is devoted entirely to the military history of the country from its beginnings to the outbreak of the war. A short study of more than ordinary interest is *Early economic*

effects of the war upon Canada by Adam Shortt, published by the division of economics and history of the Carnegie endowment for international peace. Interesting also is another study of social and economic conditions, "Canada at war," by Thomas Forsyth Hunt, in the *University of California Chronicle*, volume xx, number 2. Nellie L. McClung's *Next of kin* is a picture of the life and work of Canadian women in war time. Of personal narratives recently published the following may be regarded as having considerable permanent historical value: *Captured*, by J. H. Douglas, the story of a Canadian war prisoner; *Winged warfare*, by W. A. Bishop, the famous Canadian aviator; *From Montreal to Vimy Ridge and beyond: letters to his Canadian mother by a graduate and fellow of Johns Hopkins university.*

ACQUISITION OF MATERIAL

The normal work of the public archives of Canada in acquiring, arranging, and publishing historical material has been much handicapped by the war duties which the department has undertaken and by the absence of members of the staff on active service. In Paris every effort is being made to press forward with the copying of the records of the French régime, but in London the archives staff has been rendering assistance to the war records office and the amount of copying has decreased. No transcripts from Europe, however, are now being sent to Canada. They will be retained in London until conditions of transportation are less disturbed. From sources on this side of the Atlantic a fairly large number of important documents have been added to the archives stores. Among these are various parish records, or copies thereof, from Quebec and the maritime provinces, private letters and diaries, including copies of letters of Ludger Duvernay, one of the leaders of the popular party in the troubles of 1837-1838, a letter book of the Hudson Bay company's post at Norway House, and transcripts from the papers of the *prévôté de Québec*, the *conseil supérieur*, and the courthouse of Montreal. The archives have acquired a volume containing the original observations drawn up by the judges of Quebec upon the evidence in the investigation respecting the administration of justice in the province in 1787. Students of the period have long been aware that these documents were miss-

ing, and their discovery and acquisition is an event of note in the history of Canadian archives. A large number of early water colors, pastels, drawings, and prints have been added to the already extensive collection of pictorial records of Canadian history in the possession of the department.

The various provincial archives departments are continuing the programs of which outlines have been given in former numbers of this survey. An attempt is being made at present to coordinate to a greater degree than has hitherto been possible the work of the dominion archives with that of the archives of Manitoba and the provinces to the west.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES, GUIDES, AND CALENDARS

Two works noted in this section last year as being on the eve of publication have since appeared. The *Final report on the Lake of the Woods reference*, by the International joint commission of the United States and Canada, contains, as was then indicated, a valuable bibliography of the Lake of the Woods district. The *Guide to the J. Ross Robertson historical collection in the public reference library, Toronto*, which lists over three thousand seven hundred pictures relating to the history of Canada, was published in December, 1917. A few months later Mr. Robertson's long career as a journalist, philanthropist, historian, antiquarian, and art collector came to a close, but in this magnificent collection he has left for the public benefit one of several memorials of his services to Canada and to his native city of Toronto. It may be mentioned here that work on the catalog of the other great collection of Canadian historical pictures, that of the public archives in Ottawa, is proceeding as rapidly as circumstances will permit.

Students of the history of French Canada know how much they owe to the encyclopaedic knowledge and indefatigable labors of Pierre-Georges Roy, representative of the dominion archives in the city of Quebec. M. Roy is now adding still more to their debt by undertaking the — even for him — immense task of cataloging the provincial archives of Quebec. In the preliminary analysis it is estimated that the work will run to twenty-two volumes. The first two volumes have been published, containing the *Inventaire d'une collection de pièces judiciares, no-*

tariales, etc., etc., conservées aux archives judiciares de Québec.

It is a matter of regret to learn that the university of Toronto has discontinued, for the present year, its exceedingly useful *Review of historical publications relating to Canada*, which has constituted, since 1896, an annual critical bibliography of Canadian history. It is expected that the works of 1917 and 1918 will be reviewed in one volume, to be issued next year.

In 1896 N. O. Coté published a volume giving lists of political appointments in Canada from 1867 to 1895. This, the standard work of reference on the subject, has been completed for the first half century of confederation by the publication of a second volume, *Political appointments, parliaments and the judicial bench in the Dominion of Canada 1896 to 1917.*

PUBLICATION OF SOURCE MATERIAL

The government of Canada has established, in connection with the public archives at Ottawa, a board of historical publications, consisting of Adam Shortt, chairman, Arthur G. Doughty, the dominion archivist, Charles W. Colby of Montreal, Thomas Chapais of Quebec, and George M. Wrong of Toronto. The chairman will devote all his time to the work, and will receive the assistance of the other members of the board through conferences and correspondence. It is planned to carry out, in a systematic manner, a large program of documentary publication, covering the fields of political, social, and economic history.

While the work is being conducted from the first on the most comprehensive lines, special attention is being given to the preparation for early publication of material on three topics of the general program: the history of currency and banking from the beginnings of the French régime; the history of immigration and settlement during the early period of British rule, including the measures adopted at various periods to establish in Canada settlements of disbanded soldiers; and the constitutional history of Nova Scotia from the British conquest to the American revolution. Nova Scotia formed the link, in the development of the British colonial system, between the older colonial establishments on the Atlantic seaboard and the latter in Canada. The Nova Scotia documents, therefore, not only illustrate the beginnings of the constitutional history of the present Dominion of

Canada and serve as an introduction to the two volumes on Canadian constitutional development already published by the public archives, but should be of interest to students of the constitutional and institutional history of the American colonies which later became the United States.

A new edition of the two volumes of *Documents relating to the constitutional history of Canada*, which have been for some time out of print, is in course of preparation by the archives. The editorial work on the first volume, covering the period 1759 to 1791, which will be issued in two parts, was completed some time since, and only difficulties connected with the printing have delayed its appearance. The adverse circumstances under which the department is carrying on its work have also delayed the publication of another archives report.

The thirteenth report of the Ontario bureau of archives forms a curious and interesting addition to the literature of the beginnings of Upper Canada. La Rochefoucault-Liancourt, who traveled extensively in the United States in 1795-1797, also paid a short visit to Upper Canada and devoted considerable space to that province in his account of his travels, published in Paris in 1799. A poor translation of the *Travels*, by Henry Neuman, was published in London in the same year and a copy thereof came into the possession of David William Smith, speaker of the legislative assembly of Upper Canada and acting surveyor general. La Rochefoucault was not above a certain amount of journalistic flippancy, nor the coloring of his evidence to make a good traveler's tale, and Neuman's errors increased the inaccuracy of the picture. Smith prepared a refutation of what he considered La Rochefoucault's misrepresentations, and it is this that the Ontario bureau of archives has now published, for the first time, together with Neuman's text, the whole under the able editorship of W. R. Riddell.

Several collections of source material published in the United States have some interest for students of Canadian history. Among these are Frances G. Davenport's *Treaties bearing on the history of the United States and its dependencies to 1648*; Louise Phelps Kellogg's *Early narratives of the northwest, 1634-1699*,[1] in the series *Original narratives of early American*

[1] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 392-393.

history; Mary Cochrane Rogers' *Rogers' Rock—Lake George March 13, 1758*; Miss Kellogg's *Frontier retreat on the upper Ohio, 1779-1781*,[2] being volume XXIV of the *Collections* of the State historical society of Wisconsin; and the third, fourth, and fifth numbers of the *Manuscripts from the Burton historical collection*,[3] published by C. M. Burton of Detroit, which relate to the history of the old northwest on the eve of the war of 1812. The Connecticut historical society is about to publish *Correspondence and documents during Thomas Fitch's governorship, 1754-1766*, which will have much interest for the history of the conquest of Canada.

Canadian publications include a number of original documents of the period 1787-1828, in *Publication* number 30 of the Niagara historical society; a calendar, with extensive extracts, of the Canniff collection—documents relating to the Bay of Quinte district in the period 1770-1834—in *Papers and records* of the Lennox and Addington historical society, volume IX; Littlehales' journal of Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe's tour through southwestern Ontario in 1793—based on a different text from that used by Dr. Scadding for his edition in 1889—and extracts from Mrs. Simcoe's journal and the diary of David Zeisberger, superintendent of the Moravian Indian mission, published in the *Transactions* of the London and Middlesex historical society, part VIII; part II of the "Proudfoot papers," published in the same volume, being a continuation for 1833-1835 of the journal and other papers of the Reverend William Proudfoot, Presbyterian minister in Upper Canada, and his daughter; Vicar General Corbet's *First Catholic diocese of Upper Canada and the evolution of the Catholic separate school system*, which contains documents relating to the Reverend Alexander Macdonell, first bishop of Kingston; the Hamilton correspondence regarding affairs on the Niagara frontier during the rebellion of 1837-1838, in number 29 of the *Publications* of the Niagara historical society; and papers relating to the establishment of observatories at Toronto and Quebec, in 1840 and 1854-1855, edited by Otto Klotz in the *Journal* of the Royal astronomical society of Canada, May-June, 1913.

[2] To be reviewed later.

[3] Reviewed in this number.

MEETINGS AND PUBLISHED TRANSACTIONS

The Royal society of Canada met in Ottawa May 20, 21, 22, and 23, 1918. The following historical papers were read before the French section: "Critique de *l'Histoire de l'Acadie Française* de M. Moreou, Paris, 1873: réfutation et mise au point," by the Abbé Azarie Couillard-Després; "La Maréchaussée de Québec sous le régime français," by P. G. Roy; "Le siège de l'Amirauté de Québec sous le régime français," by P. G. Roy; "Les Français dans l'Ouest, 1671," by Benjamin Sulte; "Nos ancêtres étaient-ils des ignorants?" by Benjamin Sulte; "Le dernier effort de la France au Canada," by Gustave Lanctot; "Le Portage du Témiscouata," by the Reverend Fr. Marie-Victorin; "Arrêts, édits, ordonnances, mandements et règlements conservés dans les archives du Palais de Justice de Montréal 1701-1760: deuxième partie," by E. Z. Massicotte; "Louis Hébert," by Jules Tremblay. Among papers read before the English section were "The story of the Cariboo road [British Columbia]," by F. W. Howay; "Canada's Pacific seaboard," by E. O. S. Scholefield; "Notes for an introduction to confederation and defence: a jubilee study, 1867-1917," by William Wood; "Old church silver in Canada," by E. Alfred Jones; "Pre-assembly legislatures in British Canada," by W. R. Riddell; "The genesis of the University of New Brunswick," by Archdeacon W. O. Raymond; "Prehistoric Canadian art as a source of distinctive design," by Harlan J. Smith; "Notes on the flags of France," by A. G. Doughty; "The pre-Selkirk settlers of old Assiniboia," by the Reverend George Bryce; "Marriage in early Upper Canada," by W. R. Riddell. All these papers will be published in the forthcoming volume of *Proceedings and transactions*. The volume for 1917, containing the papers listed in the survey of last year, has been issued.

The *Annual report* of the Ontario historical society (Toronto) for 1917 has been published, as has also volume xv of the *Papers and records*, the contents of which were noted last year. No further publications of the Champlain society have appeared, although hopes are entertained that it may soon be possible to issue at least one volume of William Wood's *War of 1812*. Reference has already been made to the contents of the ninth vol-

ume of *Papers and Records* of the Lennox and Addington historical society (Napanee, Ontario) and of some of those of numbers 29 and 30 of the *Publications* of the Niagara historical society (Niagara-on-the-lake, Ontario), and of part VIII of the *Transactions* of the London and Middlesex historical society (London, Ontario). Part IX of this last series includes, among other articles, "The history of the Wilberforce refugee colony in Middlesex county," by Fred Landon, an account of a not very successful attempt to establish a colony of colored people from the United States in Biddulph township, Middlesex, in 1829-1830. The third volume of the *Papers and addresses* of the Kent historical society (Chatham, Ontario) contains papers on "The history of the Church of England in Chatham," by the Reverend Canon Howard, "The Kent bar," by M. Wilson, "Tecumseh," by Victor Lauriston, and "French and Indian place names," by L. Goulet. In the fifth *Annual report* of the Waterloo historical society (Kitchener, Ontario) are published, among shorter articles, "Waterloo county railway history," by W. H. Breithaupt, and "History of the village of Preston," a reprint of a paper prepared in 1886 by Otto Klotz. Number 6 of the *Pioneer papers* of the Simcoe county pioneer and historical society (Barrie, Ontario) is entirely devoted to a continuation of an account of "Old Penetanguishene," by A. C. Osborne. The Women's Canadian historical society of Toronto publishes, in number 16 of its *Transactions,* "The king's mill on the Humber," by K. M. Lizars, "Three years among the Ojibways, 1857-1860," by E. J. Graham, "Notes on Georgina township," by E. K. Sibbald, and some extracts from a work by Captain Thomas Sibbald, who visited Canada in 1842. The similar organization of Ottawa gives over much of its *Annual report* for 1917-1918 to an account of the opening and the equipment of its new home, the Bytown historical museum. In volume VII of this society's *Transactions* are articles on the early history of Bytown, Glengarry, and Lennox and Addington.

Little is to be recorded regarding local historical societies outside the province of Ontario. The Nova Scotia historical society has in the press an addition to its valuable series of *Collections*, but the new volume has not yet appeared.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

The *Canadian magazine* (Toronto) has published a considerable number of short historical articles in connection with the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of confederation. E. P. Weaver continues her series of studies of "Pioneer Canadian women." Another series, "Reminiscences political and personal," by Sir John Willison, one of the outstanding figures of Canadian journalism, is of unusual interest to the student of recent Canadian history. Among other articles worthy of note are: "The Canadian boat-song," by C. S. Blue; "Donald Mackenzie, king of the northwest," by E. Cawcroft; "Canada and the United States," by A. H. Colquhoun; "Sir Lomer Gouin," by J. Boyd; "Canada's relation to the war," by J. S. Ewart; "Canada's amateur soldiers," by E. W. Reynolds.

University magazine (Montreal): "The forty-ninth parallel," by Otto Klotz: "Confederation in Nova Scotia," by A. MacMechan; "Some personal impressions of the late Earl Grey," by J. MacNaughton; "A khaki university for Canadian soldiers," by H. M. Tory.

The *Bulletin des recherches historiques* (Beauceville, Quebec) continues its valuable services as a medium for the presentation of historical, and especially biographical and genealogical, information regarding French Canada. The following among many articles may be noted: "Un corsaire canadien: Jean Leger de la Grange," "La famille Du Gué de Boisbriand," "Le lieutenant-général John Graves Simcoe à Québec," "La Trinity-House ou Maison de la Trinité à Québec" (with a list of pilots, 1805-1846), all by P. G. Roy, of which the first two are also published in pamphlet form; "Un médecin irlandais à Montreal avant la cession," by A. Fauteux.

La Nouvelle France (Quebec): "Figures d'hier et d'aujourd'hui," by Canon Gosselin — sketches of the history of the Gosselin family in Canada; "Un précurseur de La Trappe du Canada," by Canon Lindsay — correspondence of Dom Urbain Guillet with Bishop Plessis of Quebec.

Revue Canadienne (Montreal): "Les officiers d'état-major des gouvernements de Québec, Montréal et Trois-Rivières sous le régime français — notes biographiques," by P. G. Roy: "Les missionaires au Canada aux débuts de la colonie," by Benjamin

Sulte, "Ballades populaires françaises au Canada," by C. M. Barbeau; "Mgr. Baudrillart et l'effort canadien"—conference on Canada's part in the war given at the Sorbonne by Monseigneur Baudrillart, rector of the *Institut catholique* of Paris.

The *Bulletin de la société de géographie de Québec* continues to publish many articles of historical as well as geographical interest.

Several articles in other periodicals, bearing on Canadian history, may also be mentioned: the continuation of "Chapters in the history of Halifax, Nova Scotia," by A. W. H. Eaton, in *Americana*; "Father Marquette at Michilimackinac," by E. O. Wood, in the *Michigan history magazine*; "The Quebec campaign of 1759," by R. E. Wylie, in the *Journal of the military service institution*; "A sketch of Archibald McDonald, a chief factor of the Hudson's Bay company and an Oregon pioneer," by W. S. Lewis, in the *Washington historical quarterly*.

MONOGRAPHS AND GENERAL TREATISES

The semi-centenary of confederation did not call forth the historical activity which undoubtedly would have it evoked had it fallen in more peaceful days. In addition to works noted elsewhere, and in last year's survey, there is a study of considerable extent in French, *La confederation canadienne*, by the Abbé L. Groulx.

Several historical works in the French language are to be noted. Father LeJeune, of the university of Ottawa, is continuing his useful *Tableaux synoptiques de l'histoire du Canada.* The Abbé Gosselin has published the second part of *L'Eglise du Canada après la conquête*, covering the period 1775-1789. The second volume of *Acadie—reconstitution d'un chapitre perdu de l'histoire d'Amérique*, by Edouard Richard, edited by Henri d'Arles, has been published. It may be noted that there is a study of Richard's book, by the Reverend M. F. O'Reilly and the Reverend J. M. Lenhardt, in the *Records* of the American Catholic historical society for September, 1917. An important work bearing on the history of education in the province of Quebec is *Le conseil de l'instruction publique et le comité catholique*, by Boucher de La Bruère. The studies constantly being carried on in Quebec in the fields of local history and genealogy are represented this year by Casimir Hébert's *Histoire de Saint Gabriel*

de Brandon et de ses démembrements, Aegidius Fauteux' *La famille d'Aillebout*, and the Abbé A. Couillard-Després' *Histoire de la famille et de la seigneurie de Saint-Ours*. G. Ahearn is continuing in the *Bulletin médical de Québec* his history of the medical profession in the province, and the Canon Huard has published, in the *Naturaliste canadien* (Quebec), an important study of the life of the celebrated Canadian naturalist, the Abbé Provancher.

The year 1917 saw the hundredth anniversary of the founding of the bank of Montreal. An attractive little memorial pamphlet was issued, *The centenary of the bank of Montreal 1817-1917*. In the *Queen's quarterly* (Kingston, Ontario) W. Sage has a study of "Sir George Arthur and his administration of Upper Canada." The county council of Lambton has published a compilation by Judge MacWatt, *Short sketches with photographs of the wardens, parliamentary representatives, judicial officers and county officials of the county of Lambton from 1852 to 1917*. Number 26 of the *Bulletins* of the departments of history and political and economic science in Queen's university, Kingston, contains a study in contemporary economic history by H. Michell, *Profit-sharing and producers' coöperation in Canada*.

Several works published in the United States have interest for Canadians. Prominent among these is *An old frontier of France—the Niagara region and adjacent lakes under French control*,[4] by Frank H. Severance, who gives here the fruit of extensive and minute investigations on the subject. The work constitutes volumes xx and xxi of the *Publications* of the Buffalo historical society. Volume vii, number 1 of the *Publications* of the Indiana historical society is given up to a brilliant piece of historical research by P. G. Roy, *Sieur de Vincennes identified*. *The historical geography of Detroit*, by A. E. Parkins, and *History of Detroit, 1780-1850, financial and commercial*, by C. M. Burton, have some bearing on Canadian history. So, too, has J. Schafer's *History of the Pacific northwest*,[5] originally published in 1905, of which a new edition has now appeared.

An event of more than ordinary interest to Canadian readers is the publication of a new edition of the *Encyclopedia Ameri-*

[4] Reviewed *ante*, 4: 519-520.

[5] Reviewed in this number.

cana. The fifth volume, now ready for distribution, devotes a very large space to Canada and things Canadian. The historical information contained in the various sections is remarkably complete and trustworthy.

In addition to those noted last year, the following doctoral dissertations relating to Canadian history are in course of preparation: *British colonies and imperial defence, 1860-1915*, by Paul Knaplund; *The relations between New England and the maritime provinces of Canada, 1749-1815*, by R. A. L. Clemen; *Relations between Canada and the United States, 1861-1865*, by W. F. Raney; *Immigration and settlement in Canada before confederation*, by B. M. Stewart; *The establishment of federal government in Canada*, by R. G. Trotter; *The international trade of Canada, with particular reference to the period since 1890*, by J. Viner; *The life of Robert Baldwin: a study in Canadian politics*, by E. Wilson.

A very important contribution to the history both of Canada and of the American colonies before the revolution has been completed during the past year in *The history of the post office in British North America*, by William Smith, secretary of the board of publication of the public archives of Canada, and for eleven years secretary of the post office department. It is to be hoped that the difficulties connected with publication in these days will not too long delay its appearance. A local study by Mr. Smith on the history of the post office in Nova Scotia, will be published shortly, it is expected, in the *Collections* of the historical society of Nova Scotia. Another study worthy of note which is approaching completion is *The history of land granting in Upper Canada*, by G. C. Patterson. The Abbé Ivanhoe Caron has in the press a monograph on the overland expedition to Hudson Bay led by the Chevalier de Troyes from Quebec in 1686. A preliminary study of the same subject was published by him in volume XII, number 3, of the *Bulletins* of the Société de géographie de Québec.

MARKING OF HISTORIC SITES

Some account of the memorial services at Ottawa on July 2, 1917, in honor of the fiftieth anniversary of confederation was given in the survey of last year. This and other memorial ser-

vices and markings of historic sites are recorded in the *Annual report* of the Historic landmarks association of Canada, 1918, and the *Annual report* of the Ontario historical society, 1917. A peculiarly noteworthy event was the unveiling, on October 24, 1917, in his native city of Brantford, of a magnificent memorial to Alexander Graham Bell. Such also was the unveiling, on July 1, 1918, of a sun dial in Queen Anne dominion park, Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia, site of the old fort of Annapolis Royal. This sun dial was presented by Colonel R. J. Shannon, of Brockport, New York, as a memorial to his ancestor, George Vaughan, who served in General Nicholson's army at the capture of Port Royal—then renamed Annapolis Royal—by the British in 1710.

ETHNOLOGICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK

In spite of various untoward circumstances, the division of anthropology of the geological survey of Canada has made some notable progress in anthropological work during the year July 1, 1917, to July 1, 1918. The museum building is still necessarily closed to the general public, but the exhibits remain intact and can be thrown open very shortly after the museum building is again utilizable for its proper purposes. Conditions for field research remain unfavorable. It is gratifying, however, to report that the division has been enabled during the summer of 1918 to undertake a few trips of anthropological interest.

E. Sapir, the head of the division, was engaged for the greater part of the year in researches in American Indian linguistics. A paper on *The position of Yana in the Hokan stock* has been published by the university of California during this period; an extensive Paiute grammar has been completed for incorporation in the *Handbook of American Indian languages*, issued by the bureau of American ethnology; while a series of Paiute and Ute texts, to be published by the university of Pennsylvania museum, has been all but completed. Research work on a group of languages provisionally known as Penutian and extending from California through Oregon and Washington to the Tsimshian of British Columbia, was continued and is expected to lead to conclusions of far-reaching importance. The problem of kinship systems is now of considerable interest in anthropological

circles. A paper on *Yana terms of relationship* was published by the university of California during the period covered by this report. Further papers on the kinship systems of the Naas river and of the Kootenay Indians have been prepared and will be published in the near future.

C. M. Barbeau has been making splendid progress in his researches in French Canadian folklore. During this period he has added very materially to his stock of tales, songs, and data on old French-Canadian customs. Through his untiring efforts, much valuable material has been received also from various coadjutors, notably Mr. E. Z. Massicotte of Montreal, Quebec. The formation of Quebec and Ontario branches of the American folk-lore society evidences the wide-spread interest in folk-loristic labors. A second set of French Canadian folk tales, comprising one of the quarterly issues of the *Journal of American folk-lore*, has appeared during the year, while an extensive volume on the music of the French-Canadians has been prepared with the collaboration of Mr. Jean Beck of Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, for publication in the memoir series of the American folk-lore society. In connection with the establishment of the Ontario branch, Mr. Barbeau has arranged for the appearance of a number of the *Journal of American folk-lore* devoted entirely to European folklore as preserved in Canada outside of Quebec. Contributors to this number are F. W. Waugh, W. J. Wintemberg, C. M. Barbeau, J. A. Teit, and Miss F. E. Bleakney. During the summer of 1918 Mr. Barbeau undertook extensive researches in the folklore and old-time customs of the French-Canadians of the lower St. Lawrence, accumulating valuable data at Notre Dame du Portage and Ste. Anne des Monts.

F. W. Waugh was chiefly concerned with researches on the mythology and medicine of the Iroquois Indians. An extensive collection of Iroquois folk tales is all but ready for publication. During the summer of 1918 he undertook a continuation of former field trips among the Iroquois of Six-Nations reserve, Ontario.

Owing to publication difficulties occasioned by the war, a number of manuscripts in the possession of the division of anthropology have been turned over to other institutions. This is notably true of J. A. Teit's collection of Tahltan and Kaska tales,

now in the hands of the American folk-lore society. One installment of this material has already appeared in a number of the *Journal of American folk-lore.* A very extensive ethnological manuscript on the Sioux Indians of Manitoba, submitted by W. D. Wallis, has been referred for possible publication to the American museum of natural history.

F. H. S. Knowles, the physical anthropologist of the division, has been making good progress on his extensive report on the physical characteristics of the Iroquois, both living and as preserved to us in skeletal remains. He has also in progress a series of portrait busts and photographic enlargements intended eventually to acquaint the public with the main types of Canadian aborigines.

H. I. Smith, the archaeologist of the division, has done a considerable amount of systematizing of his archaeological files, with a view to preparing a number of special monographs on selected aspects of Canadian archaeology. A very striking and, it is to be hoped, most useful aspect of anthropological work has been inaugurated by Mr. Smith in the course of the year. This is the calling the attention of manufacturers and artists to the possibilities of the application of Indian designs to industrial purposes. With this object in view, Mr. Smith has prepared an album of prehistoric designs in Canada. It is hoped that this volume may be followed by others similarly presenting designs from the Indians of today. In the summer of 1918, Mr. Smith undertook an archaeological reconnaissance field trip in the northern interior of British Columbia.

The Ontario *Archaeological report* for 1917, is, as usually, attractively printed and supplied with interesting and valuable illustrations. It contains articles on "The Nipissings"; "Ontario Indians — their fish, fisheries, and fishing appliances"; "The narrows between Lake Simcoe and Lake Couchiching," by J. H. Hammond; "Earth's first man," by the Very Reverend W. R. Harris; "Samuel de Champlain," by Colonel G. E. Laidlaw; notes on various Indian village sites; and a list of accessions to the museum.

James F. Kenney

Public Archives of Canada
Ottawa, Canada

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence

In the course of some studies of the events of the decade preceding the revolution with especial reference to Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Kentucky, I have again and again during the past dozen years encountered new evidence directly or remotely bearing upon events in Charlotte, Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, in May, 1775. This evidence became so cumulative in the course of time that it seems desirable, in the interest of historical truth, to set it forth for general consideration.[1]

In chief measure owing to the fact that certain natives of North Carolina, of accredited reputation as historical students, have rejected the contention that Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, declared herself free and independent of Great Britain on May 20, 1775, it is believed that American historians as a rule have followed their lead, without busying themselves in first-hand study of the subject. Indeed, it is customary for historical writers, sometimes on apparently slight grounds, to observe that "authorities are united in discrediting the so-called Mecklenburg Declaration of May 20, 1775."[2]

The most serious blow ever given to the contention that Mecklenburg county declared her independence on May 20, 1775, was unwittingly dealt by Peter Force in the discovery in 1838, of the record of a series (incomplete) of resolves dated Charlotte Town, Mecklenburg county, May 31, 1775, in the *Massachusetts Spy or American Oracle of Liberty*, of July 12, 1775.[3] It will be recalled

[1] Cf. my address, "The revolution in North Carolina in 1775," delivered in Charlotte on May 19, 1916, and published in *Charlotte Observer*, May 20, 1916. It was afterward privately printed in pamphlet form. Important evidence not cited there is embodied in the present communication.

[2] Edward Channing, *History of the United States* (New York, 1905-), 3: 161, n. 1.

[3] Nine years later, the entire series of resolves was found printed in the *South Carolina Gazette and Country Journal*, June 13, 1775, and since that time these resolves have been found in a number of contemporary newspapers.

that the original minutes of the convention, kept by John McKnitt Alexander, the secretary, were burned when his house was destroyed by fire in 1800; and the claim for a declaration on May 20, 1775, only sprang into prominence some nineteen years after the records were burned. The publication in 1819 of the claim for a declaration on May 20 and the publication by the state of North Carolina in 1831 of a pamphlet containing the testimony of a considerable number of eyewitnesses and participants in the proceedings eventuating in the alleged declaration laid the foundations of evidence for those who contend for a declaration on May 20.

It was the sensational discovery in 1838, and again, more completely, in 1847, of a series of resolves of date May 31, 1775, which soon gave rise to the belief that the eyewitnesses and participants, in testifying to an unconditional declaration of independence on May 20, were in reality imperfectly recalling the resolves of May 31, which assert conditional independence. The alleged declaration of May 20 is now very generally believed, principally on the evidence cited above, to be an involuntary figment of the fancy; and hence it has been called a myth. The whole remarkable story of the Mecklenburg declaration of independence has been cleverly termed "a strange and almost incredible story of the fallibility of human memory."

Since the original records kept by the secretary of the convention were burned in 1800, no draft conclusively demonstrated to have been copied from the alleged original declaration has come to light. Moreover, no strictly contemporaneous record, namely of the year 1775, testifying that the people of Mecklenburg county declared themselves free and independent of Great Britain on May 20, 1775, has yet been discovered. A remarkable allusion to the matter, however, is contained in an historical paper written in German by Traugott Bagge in 1783, of which the following is a literal translation:

"I cannot leave unmentioned at the end of the 1775th year that already in the summer of this year, that is in May, June, or July, the County of Mecklenburg in North Carolina declared itself free and independent of England, and made such arrangements for the administration of the laws among themselves, as

later the Continental Congress made for all. This Congress, however, considered these proceedings premature."[4]

The passage reads as follows: "Ich kan zu ende 1775*sten* Jahres nicht unangemerkt lassen, dasz schon im Sommer selbizen Jahres, dasz ist im May, Juny, oder July, die *County Mecklenburg* in Nord *Carolina* sich fuer so frey u. *independent* von England *declarirte*, u. solche Einrichtung zur Verwaltung der Geseze unter sich machte, als jamalen der *Continental Congress* hernach ins Ganze gethan. Dieser *Congress* aber sahe dieses Verfahren als zu fruehzeitig an."

During the course of my researches along wholly different lines, a new field of inquiry presented itself to me with reference to two circumstances directly connected with the unimpeachable evidence now accessible. This inquiry resolved itself into two parts.

The question to be settled, if possible, is the source of Bagge's information. Here is an indisputable reference to an unconditional declaration of independence. If it could be shown that, although he did not make his record until 1783, he learned the facts recorded, in 1775, and from an eyewitness and participant in the proceedings which eventuated in a declaration of independence, this would establish the contemporaneousness of his information.

Another question to be settled is one of fact in regard to the date of the meeting at which independence was declared. No contemporaneous draft of such a declaration, if such declaration were made, is known to be extant. The secretary of the convention, John McKnitt Alexander, left a series of notes indubitably made in 1800 or later, in which he states among other things, that on May 20, 1775,

"1st. We (the County) by a *Solemn* and *awfull vote*, *Dissolved* our allegiance to King George & and British Nation.

"2d. Declared our selves a free & independent people, having

[4] Adelaide L. Fries, *The Mecklenburg declaration of independence as mentioned in the records of Wachovia* (Raleigh, N. C., 1907). So strikingly confirmatory was this entry of the century-old claims for a Mecklenburg declaration of independence that its discovery in 1904 once more projected the much-mooted subject into the field of national discussion.

a *right* and *capable* to govern ourselves (as a part of North Carolina).''[5]

The historians who question the contention that a declaration of independence was made in Charlotte on May 20, 1775, maintain that John McKnitt Alexander, in referring to a declaration made on May 20, was thinking of the series of resolves passed on May 31. The real question to be decided, from independent sources and by irrefutable documentary evidence strictly contemporaneous, is the actual date of the meeting on which independence was declared. Was it May 19-20, and an unconditional declaration of independence, of which no copy of the original is now known to be extant? Or was it May 30-31, and a conditional declaration of independence, reproduced as a series of resolves in a number of contemporary newspapers?

A considerable number of participants, eyewitnesses, or men who recorded directly the statements of participants and eyewitnesses, have given testimony in regard to events in Mecklenburg county in May, 1775. The testimony of those who, by reason of active participation in the events themselves or because possessed of unusually acute memory are best qualified to judge, is explicit on three points, viz.: *that the convention met first on May 19; that the news of the battle of Lexington (April 19, 1775) reached Charlotte on May 19*; and *that it was the dramatic arrival of this startling news which immediately precipitated the unconditional declaration of independence on the following day, May 20, 1775.*[6]

The genuine significance of this collocation of the date of one event with that of another has hitherto escaped the thoughtful attention of historical investigators. When the eyewitnesses gave their testimony (1819-1830), no draft of the resolves of May 31, passed by the small group of the committee of safety, had come to light. Nothing in after years could so conclusively have refuted the testimony of the participants as their identifica-

[5] A minutely accurate copy of these notes, of unquestioned validity, is preserved among the Bancroft transcripts in the New York public library. A photographic facsimile is in Hoyt's *The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence* (New York, 1907), beginning opposite p. 126.

[6] Testimony of the witnesses is given in detail in my address, ''The revolution in North Carolina in 1775,'' in *Charlotte Observer*, May 20, 1916.

tion of the date of the first day of the two-days' meeting by means of the date of some other happening. The skeptics in regard to the "Mecklenburg declaration of independence" asseverate, without proof, that there was and could have been no meeting on May 19 and 20, on which latter date independence was declared. The participants and eyewitnesses, who were present and heard the declaration read, in the lapse of years might well have forgotten the exact phrases of the declaration, but not its explicit assertion of unconditional independence; they might, by an almost infinite stretch of the imagination, have all forgotten exactly the same way, and recalled incorrectly the dates May 19 and 20; but it appears mentally inconceivable and psychologically impossible that they could also have forgotten the same way on another fundamental point, viz. — that the arrival of the news of the battle of Lexington was the soul-stirring, revolutionary event which precipitated an unconditional declaration of independence.

The pivot upon which this phase of the classic controversy resolves is the query: On what date did the news of the battle of Lexington actually reach Charlotte?[7]

If it could be shown that the news of the battle of Lexington first reached Charlotte on May 30, it would completely demonstrate that the participants, in speaking of a declaration of independence on the day following the arrival of the news, were imperfectly recalling the resolves of May 31. If, however, it is proven that the news of the battle of Lexington first reached Charlotte on May 19, this fact completely demonstrates that the popular convention actually did take place on May 19 and 20, 1775. If the actual participants and eyewitnesses are entitled to more credence than "witnesses" now living, then the testimony of the former is conclusive that the unconditional declaration was made by the popular convention, and by no other body, on the second day of the two-days' meeting as the result of the arrival of the news of the battle of Lexington on the first day.

In the effort to resolve this question, I have studied the routes

[7] This line of research which I have employed is a new avenue from which to approach the problem. This point is wholly missed or evaded by Hoyt, whose book, *The Mecklenburg declaration of independence*, while thoroughly illogical at many points, exhibits the methods of the trained historical investigator.

of travel over which couriers must have passed in bringing the news southward from Philadelphia, leaving there on April 25. Everywhere the injunction, sometimes fervently endorsed on the very despatch itself, was to send the news on without the slightest delay, and to disseminate it throughout the adjoining counties. By a series of contemporary records, made in the year 1775 and fully attested, I have proven that the news of the battle of Lexington actually *did* reach Charlotte on May 19, 1775—for example, reaching Salem, slightly more than a day's journey from Charlotte, on May 17, and Anson Court House, slightly farther than Charlotte from Salem, about May 20.[8] This investigation indisputably fixes the date of the popular convention as May 19 and 20, 1775, and not May 30 and 31, 1775. It furthermore indisputably establishes, on the evidence of the participants and eyewitnesses, that the county of Mecklenburg through a popular convention declared itself free and independent of Great Britain on May 20, 1775, and not on May 31, 1775. For it is agreed by the participants and eyewitnesses that it was the popular convention, and no other body, which made an unconditional declaration of independence on the second day of the two-days' meeting, as the result of the arrival of the news of the battle of Lexington on the first day. The action of May 31, at a meeting on this one day only, was the action of an entirely different and much smaller body, namely, the committee of public safety of Mecklenburg county who at this, their first meeting, voted to send copies of the various proceedings by an express rider, Captain James Jack, to the continental congress at Philadelphia.

In 1783, Traugott Bagge recorded in his *Bruchstück* that the county of Mecklenburg in 1775 (May, June or July)[9] declared

[8] Travel on foot would have brought the news to Charlotte on May 25, by rider at a rapid rate of speed on May 13. As instance of the absurdity of the contention that the news first reached Charlotte on May 30 is the fact that the news actually reached Boonesborough, Kentucky, passing over one of the worst roads on the continent, just cut out by Daniel Boone and his axemen in the employ of Colonel Richard Henderson, on May 29. See R. Henderson's diary, Draper manuscripts, 1CC21-130, Wisconsin historical society. For an elaborate treatment of the subject, see my article, "The revolution in North Carolina in 1775," in *Charlotte Observer*, May 20, 1916.

[9] I am able to state precisely, on the basis of recorded facts, the reason why Bagge was uncertain as to the date within the limits given. Bagge knew that the declaration was made after the arrival in May of the news of the battle of Lexington.

itself "frey u. *independent* von England." Captain James Jack, according to his attested certificate of December 7, 1819, was present when the county of Mecklenburg declared itself free and independent of England; as an express rider especially commissioned for that purpose he bore the "Mecklenburg declaration of independence," as he termed it, to Philadelphia and there delivered it to the delegates to congress from North Carolina. If anyone living in the year 1775 knew the exact nature of the paper, such as, for example, that it was an unconditional declaration of independence, it surely was Captain James Jack. For he was present when it was, as he says, "publicly proclaimed from the court-house door in the town of Charlotte"; he heard it read aloud again, as he records, by Colonel William Kennon in Salisbury, while on his way to Philadelphia; and moveover, as bearer, unpledged to secrecy, of the copies of the proceedings in Charlotte, which he termed the "Mecklenburg declaration of independence," he was without doubt accurately informed as to its exact nature and purport. If Bagge received his information from Jack in 1775, then his testimony is both authentic and essentially contemporaneous.

In a circular letter dated June 19, 1775, addressed to the town and county committees of safety, written by Richard Caswell and signed with his own name and those of his North Carolina colleagues in the continental congress, William Hooper and Joseph Hewes, Caswell urged his constituents to form themselves into militia companies and to be in readiness to resist force by force. Caswell sent copies for the western counties of North Carolina during the last week in June, 1775, "by a man," said a member of the New Bern committee, "who was going from Philadelphia to Mecklenburg county."[10] Who was this man and did he see Bagge? He bore with him copies of Caswell's circular letter for the committees of safety of Surry,

He also knew that it was made before the organization of the Surry county committee of public safety in August; for the very man who brought the news of the declaration also brought a letter addressed to that committee before it was even in existence. Compare *Salem diary* and *Aeltesten Conferenz Protokoll.* Had Bagge, in writing his "Fragment," referred to the *Salem diary* of July 12, 1775, he might have narrowed the limits of his uncertainty by omitting the word July."

[10] *Colonial records of North Carolina*, 10: 65, 66, 85. For Caswell's letter, *ibid.*, 10: 23.

Rowan, Mecklenburg, and Anson counties. Who saw him arrive at Salem, consulted with him, and received from him a copy of Caswell's letter? Captain Jack was in Philadelphia on June 23;[11] and "returned with a long, full, complasent letter from s[d] 3 members, recommending our *zeal, perseverance order & forbearance* &c."[12] "The arrival of the messenger at Salem, North Carolina, on July 7, is recorded in a historical sketch written in 1783 by an eye witness," admits Hoyt himself. The name of the author of this sketch is not given by Hoyt.

The natural surmise is that Bagge derived his information that "Mecklenburg county declared itself free and independent of England" from Jack. The striking evidence to that effect is now before us, derived from the Moravian archives. The eye-witness of the messenger's arrival, the author of the historical sketch of 1783, whose name is withheld by Hoyt, was none other than Traugott Bagge.[13] The entry of this very date (July 7, 1775) in the *Salem diary*, a diary of communal life kept unbroken from 1752 to the present time, reveals the identity of the messenger, who indubitably informed Traugott Bagge that Mecklenburg county had declared itself "frey u. *independent* von England" and handed him a letter which was a duplicate of the one he bore to the committee of safety of Mecklenburg county. This messenger was none other than Captain James Jack. The entry is as follows:

"July 7, 1775. Diesen Nachmittag uberlieferte ein Mann aus dem Mecklenburg der als ein *Expresser* von dort zum Congress in Philadelphia geschickt worden war auf seinem Retour, wieder ein Circular, an Mr. Traugott Bagge addressiert; selbiges war unterschrieben von Hooper, Hewh and Casewill; es enthielt eben ein encouragement zum Gewehr zu griefen, etc. . ."[14]

The English translation is as follows:

This afternoon a man of Mecklenburg, who had been sent as

[11] Joint certificate of Alphonso Alexander, Amos Alexander, and Joseph McKnitt Alexander, cited in Hoyt, *The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence*, 66-67.

[12] Notes of John McKnitt Alexander, secretary of the convention, in Bancroft transcripts, New York public library.

[13] Letter of Miss Adelaide L. Fries to the writer, June 7, 1916. The original historical sketch, in Bagge's unmistakable handwriting, is now in the archives in Salem, whence it had formerly been removed to Bethania, North Carolina.

[14] I was greatly assisted in this research by Miss Adelaide L. Fries, curator of the Moravian archives at Salem, who at my request made a close examination, and also

an *express* from there to congress in Philadelphia, upon his returning journey delivered here a circular addressed to Mr. Traugott Bagge; the same was signed by Hooper, Hewh, and Caswill; it actually contains an encouragement to take up arms, etc.

To resume, this research exhibits two remarkable specimens of evidence, based on contemporaneous documentary records, indicating that Mecklenburg county declared itself free and independent of Great Britain, and that this unconditional declaration of independence was made on May 20, 1775.

1. The men who participated in the proceedings in May, 1775, assert that they declared themselves free and independent of Great Britain on the day immediately following the arrival of the news of the battle of Lexington. It is shown herein that the news arrived in Charlotte on May 19. *Ergo*, the county of Mecklenburg declared itself free and independent of Great Britain on May 20, 1775.

2. There is herein established the essential contemporaneity of Traugott Bagge's assertion that in 1775 (May, June, or July) Mecklenburg county declared itself "frey u. *independent* von England." For it is shown, beyond any reasonable doubt, that Bagge received this information from the bearer of the "Mecklenburg declaration of independence" to Philadelphia, Captain James Jack, on his return from that place during the course of a brief stop at Salem, North Carolina, on July 7, 1775.

Archibald Henderson

aided me in my own personal examination, of the *Salem diary*. Among the papers found by Miss Fries in the Moravian archives, bare announcement of the discovery of which was made in December, 1914 (cf. *Publications of the North Carolina historical commission*, Bulletin 18 [1915], p. 55), is Caswell's circular letter of June 19, 1775, delivered by Captain James Jack to Traugott Bagge on July 7, 1775.

The controversy over neutral rights between the United States and France, 1797-1800. A collection of American state papers and judicial decisions. Edited by James Brown Scott, director. [Carnegie endowment for international peace, division of international law] (New York: Oxford university press, 1917. 510 p. $3.50)

This collection of papers is published as an exposition of the policy and legal theory of the United States in the controversy with France over neutral rights. This book is in no sense a history of that controversy. It does not take into consideration the circumstances of the opposing parties, nor does it treat of the development of their policies. Its appearance is timely, however, as an illustration of one of the most important examples of the "abundant American precedent" to which President Wilson appealed in stating his policy to congress on February 16, 1917.

The book is at once removed from any suggestion of partisanship by the fact that no part of it, except the preface, was composed with the present struggle in view. The historical introduction is taken bodily from "the note of J. C. Bancroft Davis's *Treaties and Conventions between the United States and other Powers*" published in 1873. This introduction might well contain some new material, but as it stands it serves the purpose admirably, and no one can accuse the author of anti-German feeling. The editor furnishes only a few formal notes, mostly citations, and offers no comments on the text.

Part I presents the policy of the United States towards French violations of American neutrality. The material offered is limited to the speeches of President Adams to congress (the editor calls them messages although this is hardly in accord with the facts), the replies and *Acts of congress,* and some proclamations "by the President." In these documents there is no discordant note to mar the harmony of congress and President Adams.

In no part of the book is the aloofness of the editor from comment more justified than here. A cursory reading of the text will show that the attitude of the French directory is paralleled for a long way by that of the present German empire, and that the policies of Adams and Wilson are in fundamental agreement. John Adams saw the French directory trying "to separate the people of the United States from the

Government,'' and ''to produce divisions fatal to our peace.'' He advocated ''permitting our vessels to employ means of defence while engaged in lawful foreign commerce,'' and ''putting under convoy such vessels as remained unarmed.'' He felt that ''respect to treaties has been so diminished, and the law of nations has lost so much of its force, while pride, ambition, avarice, and violence have been so long unrestrained'' that measures of defence were necessary. At all times, however, he expressed his willingness to negotiate further. The violence of the directory, too, fell short of murder, and the French people came to their senses before irreparable estrangement took place.

Part II is a group of cases and legal opinions ''regarding the origin, nature, extent, and legal effect of the hostilities between the United States and France,'' treated from the standpoint of international law. Here are reports on The Charming Betsy, Gray *v.* United States, Cushing *v.* United States, and other cases equally well known. As far as this section points the way to a settlement with Germany the United States should demand indemnity for all losses suffered by violations of the rights of American commerce. The large number of cases printed in full can hardly be intended for the student of international law. They are easily accessible and their grouping is not new. On the other hand, the long and technical legal opinions regarding salvage, recapture, illegal voyages and the like will hardly appeal to the general reader, even though he is interested in public affairs.

This book ''is issued as a contribution to American precedent,'' and it may be added that the precedent in the mind of the editor is entirely legal. Of the more than five hundred pages of text, only seventy-five are used to explain the policy of the Adams administration. This section serves hardly more than an introduction to the ''case-book'' of three hundred forty pages that follows. The appendix, containing the treaties of 1778, the consular convention of 1788, and the convention of 1800, are also adjuncts to the legal parts of the book.

PAUL C. PHILLIPS

State tax commission. A study of the development and results of state control over the assessment of property for taxation. By Harley Leist Lutz, Ph.D., professor of economics, Oberlin college. [Harvard economic studies, volume XVII] (Cambridge: Harvard university press, London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford university press, 1918. 673 p. $2.75 net)

It is noteworthy that in the recent movement for tax reform growing emphasis has been laid upon problems of administration. If methods of assessment were to be improved, changes in law were less essential than reforms in the work of administering the existing laws. An interesting

illustration of the change in emphasis which has taken place in the study of problems of taxation is found in the proceedings of the National tax association. Ten years ago they discussed theory; today the practical experiences of tax assessors and state boards make up most of the annual volume. This new interest is now beginning to be reflected in the literature on taxation, of which the book under review is one of the best products.

The state tax commission is the last step in the development of state control over the assessment of property for taxation. Beginning with the state equalization of local assessments, the expansion of state control led next to the state assessment of certain statewide corporations like railroads, and finally to state supervision of local assessment through the agency of a state tax commission. Only by this last method has there been secured any scientific coördination of the work of scattered and unrelated local officials and an effective supervision and control of their work. Mr. Lutz describes this historical development in the first four chapters, but the bulk of the volume is devoted to a careful and critical description and appraisal of the work of the more important state tax commissions. Of such commissions in the Mississippi valley Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Kansas, and Ohio are selected for detailed treatment, a chapter being devoted to each. The other states in this section have not advanced far enough as yet to have developed permanent commissions.

The initial work of assessment, however, still remains in the hands of the local assessors and the great problem in the administration of the general property tax is to secure efficient service from these officials. State tax commissions are only a device, successful and necessary as far as they go, to coördinate the work of the local assessors; but the real solution of the problem lies not so much in the enlargement of state centralization as in the development of local responsibility and administrative capacity to perform local functions. In his study of the state tax commission Mr. Lutz fully recognizes these limitations and does not exaggerate its importance. The book is really broader than the title indicates and constitutes a scholarly critique of the general property tax as a whole.

E. L. Bogart

History of paper-manufacturing in the United States, 1690-1916. By Lyman Horace Weeks. (New York: Lockwood trade journal company, 1916. 352 p. $3.00)

This book provides a general survey of the development of the paper industry in the United States from its beginning in 1690 up to the year 1916. Geographically the emphasis is on the east; chronologically on

the period up to the civil war. The chief value of the book is the material assembled — from local histories, journals, and censuses of production. A mass of details has been brought together but the reader must dig for what he wants.

The adoption of the chronological method of production has in this case proved unfortunate. The reader is compelled to go through the whole book before he can be certain that he has all the information on any particular subject. Almost every chapter has something about the scarcity of raw material, notably rags. The recurrence of fragmentary information is distracting.

The author has devoted his energies to compilation. He has not stopped to make those special inquiries that are the foundation stones of an enduring work. A careful study of a few mills or a few phases of the industry might at this stage of our knowledge prove more profitable. Extraneous matter, notably the biographies of paper-makers, everywhere detracts from the value of the book as a history of paper-making. Too many pages are occupied by portraits of the chief actors in the drama. As a source book for the study of human endeavor in getting rags, making inventions, and rebuilding burnt mills, this book has a place. Its interest is really the unit of production, the mill and the mill-owner, his trials and success or failure.

Some topics of interest are omitted or inadequately treated. The history of no industry can be explained without a study of marketing conditions. It is not enough to say that the market was "local." We want to know more about actual trade, especially when we are told that Massachusetts was the greatest paper user and Pennsylvania the greatest paper maker in America in the eighteenth century. About labor conditions we learn little. Problems of capital, partnership, and company formation are scantily dealt with. The economist will find less satisfaction in this book than the antiquary or the historian.

Seldom do we meet a better illustration of the failure to use footnotes and appendices, into which it is possible to relegate facts and evidence that are of importance but which, when placed in the text, mar the description or the argument. Perhaps our author's eye objects to having the printed page broken up into text and footnotes, while his sense of arrangement and presentation is in no way offended by mosaics of facts.

The author's aim is to produce a "complete compact narrative" in an "exhaustive, comprehensive manner," covering the ground "broadly and soundly." Enough has been said to cast doubt upon the realization of these aims. In short, we are still without an adequate survey of the history of paper manufacturing in the United States; and what is more fundamental, we are without even the special studies on which such a survey must be based.

The heart of the Puritan. Selections from letters and journals. Edited by Elizabeth Deering Hanscom, Ph.D., professor of English, Smith college. (New York: Macmillan company, 1917. 281 p. $1.50 net)

The supreme duty of the hour is the winning of the war. In the gigantic common effort for that end the historical scholars of the country are taking part along many lines. A goodly number are directly engaged in "war work." Many others are rendering no less valuable service by continuing their labors along the customary lines. Of special value is the production of books and articles which bring to their readers a keener realization of the worth of the ideals for which America stands in the war. Such a service has been well performed by Miss Hanscom in the preparation of *The heart of the Puritan.*

Making bold to take issue with the dictum of Mr. George E. Woodbury that "The heart of the Puritan is a sealed book" Miss Hanscom aims to reveal that heart through a series of excerpts bearing upon the daily life and thought of the puritans. Nearly all the selections are from account books, reports, diaries, and letters written by New England puritans, though a few from non-puritan sources have been included. It is, therefore, by unconscious revelation from within that the puritan heart is to stand revealed. Whether the aim is attained, it would seem to the reviewer, must depend upon the reader. Certainly Miss Hanscom by judicious selection and skillful arrangement has done well her part. The puritans of New England here stand self portrayed. But why should a revelation of the heart of the puritan be limited to the puritans of New England? Puritanism was not confined to New England.

Miss Hanscom has wisely refrained from an excess of editorial annotation, but has not altogether avoided the opposite error. Not all the documents tell their own story. I feel sure that a good many average readers, for whom alone, we are assured, the book is intended, would have welcomed more information in regard to the writers than has been furnished. Despite the protest of Miss Hanscom that titles and editions are caviare to the general, I venture to believe that a good many of those same average readers, inspired by the book into seeking a larger knowledge of the puritans, would have welcomed such information.

FRANK M. ANDERSON

Writings of John Quincy Adams. Edited by Worthington Chauncey Ford. Volume VII, 1820-1823. (New York: Macmillan company, 1917. 516 p. $3.50.)

In no other volume of *Writings* is the reader so much impressed with the untiring labors of John Quincy Adams. Perplexing questions of the department of state consumed his time and he seemed to disregard

even the heat of Washington summers. Towards the close of August he paused to write, "As the weather is subsiding from fever heat, I have resumed my cravat." These were years when gaps in the *Memoirs* became more frequent, as in volume V, where little is recorded between May 5 and October 7, 1821, and from January 7 to April 1, 1822. On the last of these dates he wrote, "I make one more effort to resume my diary which has now suffered repeated and irreparable interruptions. I abandon definitively the attempt to keep it minute and circumstantial."

The range of subjects discussed in the letters is a wide one. Among them are the Spanish delay in ratifying the treaty of 1819; commercial disputes with France; interchange of proposals for the suppression of the African slave trade; and the claims against British officers for slaves carried away during the late war. During these three years, he gave much thought also to the domestic slave problem; to the consequences of the holy alliance; and to formulating the principles embodied in the Monroe doctrine. A document of outstanding interest, the preparation of it consuming nearly a month's time, contains portions of the instructions to Henry Middleton, minister to Russia. Over and again, he insists that "for the repose of Europe as well as of America, the European and American political systems should be kept as separate and distinct from each other as possible." For more than three years, Adams was occupied in drafting a report on "Weights and measures" which was submitted to the senate on February 22, 1821, and is a striking illustration of his ability as a master of details. Of this he says: "I have no reason to expect that I shall ever be able to accomplish any literary labor more important to the best ends of human exertion, public utility, or upon which the remembrance of my children may dwell with more satisfaction." (*Memoirs* 5: 29, *Letters,* 7: 105-106.) On the same day the exchange of ratifications of the Spanish treaty was made and of these events he wrote, "Two of the most memorable transactions of my life."

Throughout the period, he was testing himself as the probable successor of Monroe. No one knew more than he what his weaknesses as a presidential candidate were. On one page he writes Mrs. Adams, August 11, 1821: "There is not another man in the Union, excepting the Presidents past and present, who receives or continues to receive from the people of this country indications of esteem and confidence more distinguished and flattering than I have." Then he protests, "I am certainly not intentionally repulsive in my manners and deportment, and in my public station I never made myself inaccessible to any human being. But I have no powers of fascination, none of the honey which the profligate proverb says is the true fly-catcher; and be assured, my

dear friend, it would not be good policy for me to affect it. The attempt would make me ridiculous because it would be out of nature." Mrs. Adams was the one critic for whose words he seemed to have respect. He partly reveals himself when he faces the inquiry of his wife on the reason for his frequenting the theater (p. 298). He replied that he could do nothing else with the evening; that the two tickets of admission were the only returns he had from the two shares of stock he possessed in the enterprise and that all his life he had been "extravagantly fond" of that kind of entertainment. But he assures her that while the stage had been a source of amusement for him, he had enjoyed it with discretion and had never met an actress.

J. A. James

Life and letters of John Fiske. By John Spencer Clark. In two volumes. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin company, 1917. 533, 523 p. $7.50 net)

These two volumes offer an acceptable sketch of one who made a name for himself both in philosophy and history. For the historian the story of Fiske's own fight against the religious traditions of his youthful environment and of his later struggle to gain recognition of his evolutionary theories even among the cultured classes of New England will be found extremely illuminating. The author has told the story well and has shown great industry in collecting the facts. Another phase of this life that is interesting is the excellent sketches of John Fiske's home life, which offer a pleasant picture of a family of a professional man of the last generation.

The author is less happy in his portrayal of Fiske, the historian, for he has made the mistake of supposing his subject a great historian, which he unfortunately was not. Fiske had a pleasing style and one that has given his writings many readers, but his was not the mind of the man of research; he never used the archives in the manner that his contemporary Francis Parkman did, with the result that he has not left his mark on the interpretation of a single period of the history of America. Still, in spite of this exaggerated ideal of Fiske, the author has created a good biography which the reader will find enjoyable reading.

Manuscripts from the Burton historical collection. Collected and published by C. M. Burton. Number 1 - 4. (Detroit, Michigan: October, 1916 — July, 1917, 144 p. $2.00 per set)

One of the great collections of western Americana is in the Burton historical library, which the patriotic collector has given to his city.

The nucleus of the collection was formed as a by-product of Mr. Burton's profession as an abstracter, and as the collection grew the business man developed into the historical collector.

He has continued his search for material independent of business for many years until his library rivals the most noted collections of historical societies such as that of Wisconsin.

The collection, although not confined to manuscripts alone for the list of rare books and pamphlets is a very long one, is particularly remarkable for its large volumes of autograph letters, business contracts, and papers of all kinds. Mr. Burton's rule is that of all good collectors; preserve every scrap of paper, for one never knows when it will furnish the connecting link in a historic story.

Mr. Burton with the assistance of his daughter, Miss Agnes Burton, has undertaken at his own risk to make public some of the more important parts of this collection and is issuing regularly in pamphlets of about forty pages annotated transcripts. The first number contains letters from various persons interested in the development of the business of the west, such as Sir William Johnson, Sir Guy Carleton, John Askin, and many traders. They extend over a period from 1754 to 1795. This department is continued in number 2, but the bulk of this later number is made up of "documents on early Indiana history," a department that is continued through numbers 3 and 4. This includes many letters to and from Governor Harrison. The long letter of the latter to the secretary of war, dated March 3, 1805, on Indians is particularly illuminating, but it would take too much space to name all the important documents to be found in these pages.

The transcripts are carefully made and the notes are sufficient to give the reader the necessary information to understand the contents. This enterprise is a notable one and should be supported by a generous number of subscriptions from libraries and individuals.

C. W. Alvord

The Life of James J. Hill. By Joseph Gilpin Pyle. In two volumes. (Garden City: Doubleday, Page and company, 1917. 489, 459 p. $5.00 net)

Those who find their history in the biographies of the great will not look to the lives of presidents and politicians for a record of American development since the civil war. They will look rather to the lives of those "captains of industry" whose clearness of vision made them leaders in the national task of developing a continent, and despots, benevolent or otherwise, in the modern business world. James J. Hill was one of these makers of modern America. It was no mere

coincidence that he and future Lord Strathcona, each driving a dog team, should meet for the first time on the far western prairies, one hundred and forty miles from the nearest house. Each of them had an imagination, described by Mr. Pyle as "tropical," which gave him an insight into the future of the west. Each had the ability — the genius — to lay foundations for the castles of his dreams. It is a favorite task of biographers to analyze this thing called "genius." Mr. Pyle is not a bad psychologist. He delights to show the ability of his hero to make the facts of the past and present cast light upon the future, to grasp and retain unlimited detail, to work incessantly without breaking, to wait as patiently as he labored for the favorable moment, to be honest, broad-minded, patriotic through it all. But granting that these things for the most part are true, the reader grows a bit weary of their endless repetition, and can but reflect that in another age our author would have been an able contributor to the *Acta Sanctorum.*

The author's fondness for character analysis does not alter the fact that these two volumes are a substantial addition to our knowledge of transportation development in the northwest, and are distinctly worth while. Mr. Pyle has drawn freely upon the letters and papers of Mr. Hill, and has supplemented this information by means of private conversations with him and with his associates, by careful examination of the numerous court records which have opened so freely the archives of great corporations, by a first-hand acquaintance with newspaper files, and with such an historical background as the professional journalist is wont to acquire. He has traced with painstaking care and accuracy the stages by which the Hill interests grew from an idea into the gigantic system which they now are. His superior sources of information and his industry in using them enable him to shed new light all along the way. In view of the real merit of his work we can afford to bear with him while he argues for the benefit of a past generation that the consolidations of which he treats were not the outgrowth of "some Machiavellian scheme," but the result rather of the "irresistible forces of railway evolution." Admitted. But if these same "irresistible forces" should move on through federal control to ultimate government ownership, we shall hope that Mr. Hill was not correct in predicting as a result "the end of this country as a free and democratic government" (2:280).

It is remarkable in a work upon which obviously so few pains have been spared that there should be no maps to guide the reader through the maze of railway constructions and connections so constantly alluded to. But the facility with which Mr. Pyle handles twentieth-century English does much to overcome this difficulty. It is not easy to thread

one's way through "the tangled web" of railway finance, but the author's statements are never obscure. Occasionally his figures of speech are a bit rampant, but they are usually effective; as, for example, when he describes the Hill system as "a giant cornucopia whose body extends from the Great Lakes to the Ohio River, contracts as it stretches west and northwest, and pours its contents through the relatively narrow orifice of Puget Sound and Portland" (2:57). His use of the English method of spelling such words as "favour," "labour," and "honour" contrasts somewhat oddly with the screaming Americanisms which appear on every page. But he commands attention. Possibly if professional historians would cultivate a more interesting style, their services as authorized biographers would be more in demand. Until such a time it ill becomes them to criticise too freely a work which they will have frequent occasion to use.

JOHN D. HICKS

George Caleb Bingham, the Missouri artist. By Fern Helen Rusk, Ph. D., assistant in classical archaeology and the history of art, University of Missouri. (Jefferson City, Missouri: Hugh Stephens company, 1917. 135 p. $1.50)

This book is a study of the character and achievements of the artist whose name it bears. He was a man of absolute sincerity and fearlessness, who delineated with typical truthfulness the life of the Missouri frontiersman in the second quarter of the nineteenth century.

Bingham stands as an unique character in early American art history. Of Scotch-German parentage, he migrated, when but a child, to Missouri, where, we are told, traces of his childish drawings are "still quite plainly outlined on pump, fence and outbuildings." At first, primitive conditions compelled him to use as pigments brick dust, axle grease, dyes, and even his own blood.

In addition to his duties as a citizen, including the occupational pursuits and political welfare of the growing state, he continued his self-education as a painter. We find him hard at work, developing his earlier efforts in portraiture into more ambitious compositions of the animated and vivid human life with which he was surrounded.

Modern critical judgment might regard many of these paintings as theatrical and formal. But while lacking the spontaniety and freedom of more modern treatment, if gauged by the contemporary and stereotyped art forms of that time, they stand as invaluable records of realistic and exact work.

Ranging from portraits of men and women famous in Missouri and national life and a few landscapes, the paintings included the occupa-

tions and amusements of the common people. Unique among these scenes, we find election activities and boating subjects, showing marked versatility and permeated with the vitality and local color characteristic of the pioneer growth of the new west.

Convinced that George Caleb Bingham was the most successful genre painter of the period, the author has felt justified in adding the paintings of this artist to fill a distinct niche in American art history. Interweaving in an interesting and well-illustrated sequential chain, biographical anecdotes with the story of his professional training, the author has made an interesting contribution to this little-elaborated art epoch. Bingham's place as a sterling pioneer citizen of Missouri and chief delineator of genre of the period seems justified, in the light of the material presented to the reader.

William H. Varnum

Audubon the naturalist. A history of his life and time. By Francis Hobart Herrick, Ph.D., Sc.D., professor of biology, Western Reserve university. In two volumes. (New York and London: D. Appleton and company, 1917. 451, 494 p. $7.50 net)

Audubon's life coincided with a period of marvelous changes in the face of this continent and in the nation itself, his history was a part of those changes, his achievements were even then recognized and honored in both England and America, and his name is today a household word in our own country. Yet nothing like an adequate record of his career has ever appeared. Mrs. St. John's life of the naturalist (London, 1856) is both superficial and trivial. Buchanan's work (London, 1868) tho said to be based on a manuscript furnished by Mrs. Audubon lacks both interest and balance, besides being so full of errors as to be, in the judgment of the family, "useless to the world and unpleasant to them"; even as rewritten by Mrs. Audubon (New York, 1869) it is not a powerful work. The discovery of lost journals of certain trips gave the naturalist's granddaughter, Maria R. Audubon, the basis for *Audubon and his journals* (New York, 1897) in which the distinguished ornithologist, Elliott Coues, provided extensive scientific notes; but the work, important as it is, lacks unity and breadth of treatment. So the field lay open and inviting to new efforts, and the eager anticipation with which one turns to the new work is fortunately realized on its study.

Mr. Herrick is well known as one of our most thorough and careful students of bird life and consequently is peculiarly well fitted to handle a subject that unquestionably demands good ornithological knowledge for its adequate treatment. He has carried the precise analysis of a trained scientist into his historical excursion with good effect. The

various controversies, which involved Audubon and his contemporaries in such bitter struggles that they divided not only the scientific men of his time but also the academies and even cultured society in this country and England, are treated with scrupulous regard for the facts on both sides and with frank recognition of the slips of his hero not always found in the biographer.

The conspicuous merit of this work lies, however, in the mass of new data Mr. Herrick has assembled and interpreted. Much scattered material on Audubon that had been passed over unused in the earlier works has been gathered with care and utilized with critical judgment in the biography before us. The author also had the fortunate experience of the determined seeker after truth, but to an unusual degree, in disclosing new sources of information. He tells us in his preface that in 1903 in reading Audubon's *Ornithological biography* "it seemed to me most strange that but little should be known of the making of so original and masterful a character." And after fruitless search in England and America he went to France in 1913 in search of personal records of the naturalist's father who as a naval officer played an important part in French history. Good fortune brought to Mr. Herrick's notice a mass of letters and other papers of the Audubon family in possession of a notary of Couëron from which he was able to secure a wealth of evidence on unknown and disputed points in Audubon's early life and to give a vivid picture of home, parents, education, associates, and early environment — the factors that moulded and developed the character which unfolded itself in the struggle against the limitations of life in the American wilderness and in the pursuit of an ideal that seemed chimerical to all save the faithful wife whose work and inspiration during years of strenuous endeavor alone made its achievement possible.

Various dates and places have been given for the birth of Audubon but the account of his granddaughter has been most widely accepted; according to it he was born May 5 "anywhere from 1772 to 1783" in Fontainebleau, a beautiful plantation home of one of Louisiana's well known families, at Mandeville in the parish of St. Tammany. C. S. Arthur and others have pointed out grave difficulties in accepting this account. Mr. Herrick has been able to establish the fact that Jean Audubon, father of the ornithologist, who as captain served in the fleet of Compte de Grasse before Yorktown in 1781, lived from 1783 to 1789 as planter and merchant in Les Cayes, Santo Domingo. There he met a creole, Mlle. Rabin, of French parentage, and to them was born April 26, 1785, a son referred to in early documents as Jean Rabin and baptized as Jean Jacques Fougère six months before his sixteenth birthday.

The bill of the physician who assisted at the birth is reproduced in photographic form and with collateral evidence leaves no doubt of the correctness of Mr. Herrick's statements. "On March 7, 1793, Fougère at the age of 8 and Muguet [a half sister, also born at Les Cayes] at six were legalized by a regular act of adoption in the presence of witnesses at Nantes as the children of Jean and Anne Moynet Audubon." It would be impracticable to follow further here the very interesting story of the early life of John James Audubon as Mr. Herrick vividly describes it in the light of this new evidence.

While this part of the story contains the newest and most startling developments in a historical way, it by no means represents Mr. Herrick's total contribution to an understanding of the naturalist's career. With sympathetic, but none the less critical eye, he follows him through his early efforts to establish himself as a merchant and miller on the Kentucky frontier, his final reverses and abandonment of a business career, his wanderings through the west and south while hunting and painting the birds, his début as a naturalist, and the struggle to achieve against great obstacles the success that he finally won.

Whether describing travels or home life, contact with friend or critic, the desperation of poverty that often threatened him with failure or the admiration of learned societies and men of affairs, Audubon's biographer here holds our interest firm while he also wins our approval by the thoroughness of his presentation and the fairness of his conclusions.

The work is freely and splendidly illustrated. Photographs of original documents, of places and people involved in the narrative, of Audubon's original drawings, including colored plates reduced from his famous originals, and copies of paintings and photographs representing the naturalist himself form an especially attractive feature of the book. The printing is excellent, and the whole aspect of the publication accords with its merit as a historical and scientific study of the life of a great American. Its profusion of documents, letters, and personal data about men and places in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys during the first half of the last century impart to it an added appeal to the student of the history of that region.

Discussing Audubon in 1869 John Burroughs wrote "Take him all in all he is one of the most striking figures in our history while the service he has rendered to ornithology surpasses perhaps the work of any other man who has ever lived." The half century which has passed since that date has only strengthened that estimate and the present volume adds new force to the words that express the general sentiment: "America may well be proud of him."

Henry B. Ward

Ohio in four wars. A military history. By Daniel J. Ryan, former secretary of state of Ohio. (Columbus: The Heer press, 1917. 281 p. $1.00)

Ohio in four wars is a reprint from Randall and Ryan's *History of Ohio,* published in 1912, of the chapters by Mr. Ryan on the "War of 1812," the "Mexican war," the "Civil war," and the "Spanish war." The modifications in the original text which the author says in the foreword he has freely used are few and unimportant. They indicate no change in purpose or no new historical light. The justification for the second appearance is the special interest of wartime readers in such phases of history as are here treated.

The history of a state's activities at such periods means to the author a military record: the marshalling of companies, battalions, and regiments, their organization, and their activities. Nearly a half of the chapters on the Mexican war and the Spanish war are taken up with such matters. When the author ventures into the causes and issues underlying the wars he follows the partisan viewpoint popular a generation ago. Such treatment will not satisfy historical students today. This verdict is particularly true of the statement of the causes of the war of 1812. Great Britain is accused of maintaining forts and posts on American soil and encouraging numerous barbarities by Indian tribes, even going to the extent of paying the savages for American scalps (p. 2). Such gross errors are few. The book is what its author intended it should be, a work for popular reading, "an inspiration and lesson to the men and women of our State to recur to the patriotic conduct and illustrious deeds of their fathers." There are those who would charge the makers with something like carelessness in proof reading, with too seldom taking the reader into their confidence upon the kind of authorities being used, with shortcomings in determining the proportions of space to be given some of the topics, and with an intemperate use of superlatives in describing the deeds of fellow citizens. But these are faults that the readers for whom the book was written will for the most part readily forgive the author. The accounts of the adventures of J. J. Andrews, a secret service officer, and his comrades, attempting to penetrate the heart of the confederacy and destroy the railroad communication between Atlanta and Chattanooga, of the peace movement of Clement L. Vallandigham and the copperheads, of the organization of the Knights of the Golden Circle, of the plot to form a northwestern confederacy, of Morgan's raid, and of the work of the Sanitary Commission after the battle of Shiloh make extremely interesting reading at the present time.

Elbert J. Benton

Marches of the Dragoons in the Mississippi valley. An account of marches and activities of the first regiment United States Dragoons in the Mississippi valley between the years 1833 and 1850. By Louis Pelzer. (Iowa City, Iowa: State Historical Society of Iowa, 1917. 282 p. $2.50)

"The American people have always merely tolerated their army," said an officer of that army at the declaration of war in 1918, "now they must begin to cherish it." In partial fulfilment of this mission all the presses are pouring forth histories of the campaigns and regiments of our earlier army, books and articles on strategy and methods, military historical magazines, and an increasing amount of military information of every kind. In conformity with the spirit of the times Mr. Pelzer has conceived and executed a worth while account of the campaigns of the first regiment of dragoons, which was in 1833 raised to protect and range the frontier. His book, moreover, while filling a niche in the military history of our country, is also a part of the history of the west. It depicts the varied services rendered by the regiment of dragoons in the protection of the further American settlements, in guarding the distant commercial caravans to Santa Fe, and those of the Oregon emigrants in the trail to the South West Pass, in overawing the Indians, aiding in their removals, councils, and treaties, and finally in assisting to wrest New Mexico and California from our southern neighbor by the great overland marches of 1847 and 1848.

Although Mr. Pelzer does not trace the origin of the mounted dragoons whose historian he has become, any one familiar with western history will readily discover the source in the volunteer and militia rangers that were raised to protect the frontier from the time of the French and Indian war onward. "Forting" for defense, "ranging" for discovery and protection were the two devices familiar to every frontiersman. In the Wisconsin lead mines during the Winnebago outbreak of 1827 and the Black Hawk war of 1832 these well-known frontier methods were resorted to, dozens of small log forts were built into which the women and children retreated, while the men embodied in a volunteer cavalry, called by the old familiar title of "rangers." To command this troop the men chose by acclamation Major Henry Dodge, a commander of Missouri rangers during the war of 1812.

The protection afforded the frontier by Dodge's rangers and their effective part in the pursuit and capture of Black Hawk's belligerent band suggested a regular rather than a volunteer company of men to operate upon the frontier. It is fitting that the biographer of Henry Dodge should be the historian of the troop his energy founded, and his abilities gathered. It might have been well, however, if Mr. Pelzer

had traced the connection between the voluntary rangers and the dragoon regiment, and especially had given us some account of the battalion of United States rangers of 1833, which was also commanded by Dodge and which was the immediate predecessor of the dragoons.

Mr. Pelzer's book is interesting, and so skillfully has he interwoven his quotations from original accounts that one seems to be reading a narrative of a participant in the dragoon's campaigns. From the standpoint of the historian, however, there are some corrections to be made. It is nowhere said that Dodge resigned from his command because he had been promoted to larger responsibility as governor of the new territory of Wisconsin. The account of the Winnebago treaties on page 88 is badly confused; these tribesmen did not by the treaty of 1832 cede all their territory east of the Mississippi, only that south of the Wisconsin. Neither does the author state that the reason this tribe needed protection in Iowa was that they were occupying land ceded by the Sioux, the Sauk and Foxes to be kept as neutral territory — a buffer region between the two enemy factions.

With regard to orthography we are unable to account for the vagaries in spelling Indian names. The author says in his preface that he has "attempted to follow that of the Bureau of American Ethnology." Certainly his attempt has not been a success; nowhere can we find any authority for "Sac" instead of "Sauk," "Camanche" for "Comanche," nor has it been noticed that the plural of "Winnebago" is not "Winnebagoes" but the same form as the singular. We confess also a distaste for notes at the end of the text; it is trying and perplexing when enjoying a narrative to be obliged to stop and hunt through back pages for its source. In citations from the original sources we also doubt the utility of bracketed periods [.]; it seems to us that the space quod is sufficient to convey the sense.

With these slight objections, however, we note that the book is attractively printed, and well bound; maps and a few illustrations, such as portraits of Dodge and Kearny, and reproductions of some of Catlin's drawings would have added immensely to the interest.

We believe the book fulfils its purpose of "homage and recognition" that are "due to the thousands of plain, frontier soldiers for their quiet, unadorned, and often unheralded service"; and that it also adds a chapter in the building of that American army whose future the whole world is now watching with such breathless interest.

L. P. K.

Play-party in Indiana. A collection of folk-songs and games with descriptive introduction, and correlating notes. By Leah Jackson Wolford, M. A. [Indiana historical collections] (Indianapolis: Indiana historical commission, 1916. 120 pages. $1.00)

The publication of this book is a good sign. Every state historical commission, as the tide of anniversary celebrations floods westward, should foster similar collections and publications. Folk songs, folk dances, and play parties are the echoing voices of the migrations of the American people, marking not merely their geographical but their spiritual trails, tracing their paths as the changed environments affected variously their manners and characters. Those echoes are swiftly dying away. The history of the evolution of state and regional character qualities will lose valuable material if collections such as this are not speedily gathered and put into print or preserved in some available form. The importance is less whether the work be well done or ill done, so it be done, after some fashion. Experts, like Cecil Sharp, can examine and judge later, but they cannot examine and judge what is never noted down, and this part of the work probably must be done chiefly by local amateur gleaners.

Every part of our country has folk material of some kind and some quality. Some of it may have higher value absolutely for its own essential beauty than that found otherwhere; some of it may be more closely and obviously related to the main stream of folklore as we know it in England and other of the older countries, but all of it is valuable as material regarding the spiritual development accompanying the American migrations of settlement. Do not let the old revolutionary town records be burned up, nor the old records of the spread of the American civilization through the west be destroyed! Nor let the records of the growth of the character of the people found in their natural recreation, their songs and dances and games be lost! Along the course of the migrations some have done notable service in the preservation of evidence of this elusive kind. In the southern Appalachians Mrs. Olive Dame Campbell, more recently enjoying the coöperation of Cecil Sharp, has done important work, collecting songs and ballads which Mr. Sharp says are many of them purer survivals of the old English ballads than the forms remaining in England, and yet which clearly show that they have suffered a sea-change and a mountain-change into something rich and strange indeed and accurately characteristic of the people of the southern mountains. Again, in Indiana, Mr. F. C. Senour of Indiana university, is himself a mine of material and information of the Hoosier reincarnation of these same ballads; and taking a long jump in both time and miles to Texas, John A. Lomax has served for us a later and

brusquely original outcropping of this stream of instinctive song among the cowboys. The play party must be recognized as part of this movement and games should be carefully and promptly noted down in all the states, accumulating evidence fully and widely so that just as the meteorologist charts and interprets the notations of the air currents, the historian and the scholar of folklore may trace the paths and significance of these popular winds that blow where they list through the lives of the generations and the nations.

WILLIAM CHAUNCY LANGDON

Formation of the state of Oklahoma (1803-1906). By Roy Gittinger, Ph.D., professor of English history and dean of undergraduates, University of Oklahoma. (Berkeley: University of California press, 1917. 256 p. $2.00)

Students of western history will be interested in this painstaking study of the origin and development of the commonwealth of Oklahoma. The author has drawn together, chiefly from government documents, the materials which tell the story of this territory from the time in 1803 when it first became a part of the United States to the day in November, 1907, when its admission to the union was finally proclaimed. The narrative involves much besides merely local history. The whole Indian policy of the government, the various agitations for transcontinental railways, the chronic demand of the west for land and still more land, and its equally chronic disregard of restrictive laws,— these, and similar subjects, receive constant consideration.

The "dominant characteristic in the formation of Oklahoma," Mr. Gittinger tells us, "was the removal of the Indians from their lands east of the Mississippi to the country set apart for them on the Western border" (p. 3). The first two chapters of the book are therefore devoted to a description of the treaties of removal, and of the location of the tribes in their new homes. The "Indian territory" thus created was much larger than the present state of Oklahoma, including the district later organized as the territories of Kansas and Nebraska. "No political communities," President Jackson told congress in December, 1835, "can be formed in that extensive region, except those which are established by the Indians themselves or by the United States for them with their concurrence" (p. 21).

The Kansas-Nebraska bill, as the first definite break in this policy, is the subject of the third chapter. Had the author chosen to avoid a discussion of the origins of this national squabble he could hardly have merited censure. He is to be congratulated, however, upon the very satisfactory way in which he has fused together into one logical

account the various more or less conflicting theories regarding the beginnings of Kansas and Nebraska that have been advanced from time to time. He is generous, and properly so, we think, in his estimate of the motives of Stephen A. Douglas. Probably, as the author insists, Douglas never did believe that his bill would result in the erection of a new slave state. And there is reason also for the contention that he could not have foreseen "either the excitement in the North aroused by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise or the sectional hostility engendered by the struggle in Kansas" (pp. 40, 41 f. n.).

That what is now Oklahoma was not organized as a territory along with Kansas and Nebraska, Mr. Gittinger attributes in part to the special guarantees against such action previously given to the Five Civilized Tribes, but fundamentally to the relative unimportance of the matter to the states of the south. Moreover, "many people in the far South," he thinks, "still wished to keep the south-central route to the Pacific blocked so that the southernmost route might command wider support" (p. 46). Even so, a determined effort was made between 1854 and 1860 to open the Indian country, and by the latter date sentiment in the south so strongly favored such a disposition of the matter that organization probably could not have been delayed longer than ten years had not the civil war intervened (p. 54).

Chapters five and six are devoted to the problems which the civil war and reconstruction period brought to the Indian territory. It is clear from this account that the southern Indians were practically forced to recognize the authority of the confederacy because they were abandoned by the northern government. Nevertheless, the United States, when the war was over, "made this recognition a pretext for disregarding old agreements" (p. 56). The further concentration of the Indian tribes in what is now Oklahoma speedily took place, the policy of handling Indian questions by treaty was definitely abandoned, while numerous efforts to organize the Indian country into a territory betrayed the desire to pave the way for white settlement. Following this came the activity of "the boomers," who eventually by their lawlessness and threats forced the government to purchase from the Indians "their surplus lands," and to open them for settlement. Chapters ten and eleven deal with the occupation by white settlers of Oklahoma territory and the restricted Indian territory, respectively, and the final chapter reviews the struggle for an ultimate attainment of statehood. Little attention is paid to the constitutional convention and its product inasmuch as the convention records are not yet available.

The book is distinctly a scholarly production. It is elaborately footnoted, contains five excellent maps, nine short appendices, a complete

bibliography (which would be better if the articles mentioned were evaluated), and a lengthy index. Fortunately the author has no difficulty in saying what he means in the fewest possible words: otherwise, the patience of the reader would soon be exhausted in wading through the overwhelming mass of detail which such a work necessarily involves.

JOHN D. HICKS

History of the Pacific northwest. By Joseph Schafer, Ph.D., head of the department of history, University of Oregon. (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 323 p. $2.25 net)

Mr. Schafer enjoys the reputation of being an accurate and industrious historian. This fruit of his pen gives evidence of those qualities. The first edition appeared in 1905 after he had spent in Oregon about five busy years. In preparing the first manuscript he traveled extensively in the large area treated and sought to avail himself of all attainable sources. That edition was the first publication on the subject in a single and at the same time a comprehensive and dependable volume.

He was probably the first to discover that his book lacked certain elements of proportion. He was given an opportunity to study other important and, in part, unused sources in the public record office, London. The new information caused a revision of the work into this present edition.

The romantic story of the periods of discovery and exploration is retained but shortened to permit more stress on the economic and industrial development. Another improvement in perspective has resulted from the author's researches in the British archives in his treatment of the diplomacy involved in the "Oregon question." This is the best portion of the excellent book. After that is said it may seem ungrateful to call attention to an omission. While discussing with admirable illumination the American claims of Russia and the treaties which that nation signed with the United States and Great Britain in 1824 and 1825, fixing the famous boundary of "Fifty-four, forty," the author overlooks the opportunity of linking Oregon with national history by even a mention of the "no further colonization in America" portion of the Monroe doctrine.

The widely argued case of the missionary, Marcus Whitman, is handled in a just and sane manner. The hero is still there though the so-called "saving of Oregon" is properly divided among the many others who wrought on that important consummation before, during, and after Whitman's terrible ride in the winter of 1842-1843. For one who takes this stand on the controverted question it is refreshing to read this

comment on Whitman's ride (page 190): "At Washington he urged the Secretary of War to establish along the Oregon trail a line of forts and farming stations, which might serve as a protection against the Indians and also furnish emigrants with needed supplies. By the middle of May he was back at Independence, ready to take up the line of march with the great company gathering there. We have already spoken of his important services on the route."

The last third of the volume is devoted to five chapters headed: "The inland empire," "The age of railways," "The progress of agriculture," "Industry and commerce," and "Social and political change." In each chapter the author finds himself on new ground in bringing the subject treated up to date. The work is well done.

The author's last page is a plea for the conference. He says: "The remedy for the evil here pointed out [oppression of minorities in direct legislation] lies in a new institution which is no more a part of the state constitution than was the political convention, namely the conference. To an increasing extent, the people of these states are habituating themselves to the idea that all wisdom does not reside in a class dominated by a single interest. They begin to recognize that since legislation affects all interests, the proposing of legislation like the nomination of candidates for office is a matter on which all interests should be consulted."

The original edition of the work carried forty-two illustrations and maps; the present edition has but fifteen. The illustrations selected, however, are appropriate and serviceable. One other omission is less easily understood. The first edition carried a page of tender and appreciative dedication to Frederic G. Young, secretary of the Oregon historical society from the time of its foundation. This second edition has no dedication page.

EDMOND S. MEANY

Proceedings and collections of the Wyoming historical and geological society for the year 1917. Edited by Horace Edwin Hayden, M.A. Volume XV. (Wilkes-Barré, Pennsylvania: Wyoming historical and geological society, 1917. 256 p. $4.00)

This volume covers the activities of the society for the period 1915-1917. In addition to the reports of officers, list of members, and memorials of deceased members, it contains a number of papers read at meetings, including some original material.

The longest paper (pp. 37-116), written by Alfred Franklin Berlin, is a description of his collection of Indian stone implements, now the property of the society. The description is fully illustrated and the

historical commentary elaborate. The specimens were found in the Mississippi valley, some others in Pennsylvania.

The paper entitled "The reminiscences of General Isaac Jones Wistar U. S. A." (pp. 117-156), read by General C. B. Dougherty, is of general interest. The most valuable portions of this sketch are those dealing with his life in the west, particularly in California during the early days of the gold discoveries. In this connection there are numerous quotations from a diary kept by the general at the time.

The publication of original material includes the journal of B. B. Reath of a visit to Wilkes-Barré in the year 1840 (pp. 157-172). For the most part this journal is of merely local interest. The references to the roads and railways in the vicinity will, however, prove of some value to students of transportation. The publication of "The parish register of St. Stephen's Protestant Episcopal church, Wilkes-Barré Pa., 1839-1866" (pp. 191-211), brings to a close that record of confirmations and burials. There are two newspaper articles of local interest, one on the first anniversary of the society (pp. 173-184), and one on the Wyoming valley in 1859 (pp. 185-190).

The society has issued a well printed volume and deserves credit for its energy and intelligence in the collection of books and archaeological remains. It is to be regretted, however, that its publishing committee has not devoted the funds at its disposal to the publication of more local historical material. Less than one-fourth of the volume is given over to papers or records relating directly to the Wyoming valley.

J. F. W.

California: the name. By Ruth Putnam, with the collaboration of Herbert I. Priestly, Ph.D., assistant professor of history, University of California. [University of California publications in history, volume 4, number 4, p. 293-365] (Berkeley: University of California press, 1917. 72 p. $.50)

Miss Putnam goes directly to the heart of her subject by accepting the theory of Edward Everett Hale, supported by Dr. George Davidson, that the source of the word "California" is to be found in the romance, *Las Sergas de Esplandian,* or the fifth book of *Amadis de Gaula.* After summarizing the part of the romance which deals with the legendary California and the Amazons, Miss Putnam shows that this story was so widely known that one need feel no surprise on hearing that Spaniards in the new world were familiar with it. Definite mentions of the name "California," as it appears in the writings of the Spanish explorers and their official chroniclers, as well as in Hakluyt's and Ramusio's collections of voyages, are discussed.

Miss Putnam's conclusion is that in 1542 a Spaniard, Juan Paez, wrote down California as the name for the peninsula, but he did not give it as a newly-bestowed term. Who first applied the name is yet unrevealed. By 1600 it was generally used for the peninsula, and from here it gradually traveled northward to cover in time the two Californias.

With praiseworthy consideration for the reader, Miss Putnam has relegated all surmises as to the etymology of the word "California" to one appendix; and an investigation of the authorship, land of origin, and basis sources of *Amadis de Gaula* to another. The monograph is prefaced by a map.

EVERETT S. BROWN

Development of the British West Indies, 1700-1763. By Frank Wesley Pitman, Ph.D., instructor in history, Sheffield scientific school, Yale university. (New Haven: Yale university press, London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford university press, 1917, 495 p. $2.50 net)

This book is a worthy product of the historical laboratory of Yale university, where a notable group of scholars has done epochal work in the field of colonial history. It is only within recent years that the West Indies have been subjected to serious and systematic inquiry and that their position in the current of world history has begun to be made clear. The average reader is still prone to think of them, to paraphrase Trollope, as a Niggery-Hispano-Anglo-Franco-Yankee-Doodle sort of place.

The book before us represents a distinct and notable step towards placing the economic history of the British West Indies upon a solid footing. Quite ignoring all romance, the author has set about to ascertain from original sources how men really lived, moved, and had their being in that land of buccaneers and buried treasure, of hurricanes and earthquakes, of alternating famine and prosperity. So thoroughly was the life of the eighteenth century West Indian bound up with the production and distribution of sugar, that the present volume might fairly be described as a history of sugar in the British West Indies from 1700 to 1763. Sugar was the pivotal industry in Caribbean lands. To cultivate the fields of cane, negro slaves were brought from the Guinea coast of Africa in innumerable slave ships manned by sailors representing all the nations of western Europe. The civil government was adjusted to the needs of a community that was nine-tenths black. A society built upon this single industry was peculiarly dependent upon the outside world. The planting population came to look to ships that hailed from Providence, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia for lumber and staves,

fish and provisions. And in return northern skippers paid good prices for West Indian sugar and molasses.

It is this distinctive life that Mr. Pitman describes and analyzes in some of its vital phases. The opening chapter is devoted to British West Indian society, the remaining thirteen to the economic life. Political institutions are referred to only incidentally. In the eighteenth century even more than today, the tropics were "a rich man's heaven and a poor man's hell." The absence of anything approaching a middle class meant a lack of stability in social conditions. The writer undertakes to show how large-scale production crowded the poorer white people to the wall, and created a small group of wealthy plantation owners, many of whom returned to England where they became an important influence in shaping British colonial policy. Thus, the "molasses act" of 1733 arose out of the fear of planters from the soil-exhausted British islands regarding foreign competition. They feared most French competition in the fertile islands of Martinique and Guadaloupe.

Illicit trading of the North American colonies, which had developed on a large scale after the peace of Utrecht, continued apace after 1733, particularly with the French and Spanish colonies. Failure of British statesmen to adjust colonial administrative machinery to changing trans-Atlantic conditions, rendered restrictive legislation of little avail. The molasses act "marked the first triumph of the West Indian interest in England" (p. 263). "It was the serious attempt by the British government in 1760 to enforce this law," says the author (p. 272), "and again in 1764 by lower duties to interfere with trade to the foreign West Indies, that ushered in the revolutionary movement." And again (p. 325): "It was in this atmosphere of commercial depression that the germinal ideas of the American Revolution found root. Thus the enforcement of the Molasses Act at the close of the French War, after thirty years of obsolescence, prepared the way for the movement that ended in revolution." By preventing the acquisition of the French sugar islands in the Peace of Paris, the West India planting interest lost to England an opportunity to curb the maritime power of France, and necessitated "a policy of coercion that led straight to revolution." There is indeed good reason to suppose that this concession to French sea-power, because of the aid that it enabled the English colonies to secure from France during their revolt, was an important factor in determining the outcome of the war of American independence.

Chapters on the slave trade, the distribution of West Indian products in European markets, and the financial basis of West Indian commerce, constitute important contributions to West Indian history. Eleven appendices present interesting data on population, slaves, products, and

smuggling. There is an elaborate index of 63 pages, and a number of illuminating graphic charts. There is indeed little of criticism to offer. Many names and figures might have been relegated to the footnotes in the interest of readability. A detailed map of eighteenth century Jamaica would have been useful. A few typographical errors have been noted: elusive (p. 277), Heyliger (pp. 291, 331), Crab (p. 106), proportions (p. 197). But the book is a monument of painstaking industry and conscientious scholarship.

WALDEMAR WESTERGAARD

The first Canadians in France. The chronicle of a military hospital in the war zone. By F. McKelvey Bell. (New York: George H. Doran company, 1917. 308 p. $1.35)

The first contingent of Canadian forces crossed the Atlantic in October, 1914. It was the hospital unit that received the first orders to cross the channel, after three weeks existence in the rain and mud of Salisbury Plain. The author, an officer of the corps, does not seek to give a serious, detailed narrative of the establishment of the hospital although it was an achievement highly successful. It is his purpose rather to present a readable tale, stripped of gruesome truth; a story of pleasant facts. The book is a series of incidents filling in the chronological framework of the enterprise. The experiences are those of the individuals composing the unit and deal with disembarkation in England, transfer to France, establishment of the hospital and the end to which all efforts had been directed, the reception of the wounded soldiers. There are stories of the two distinct groups preceding the Canadians, English Tommies and German prisoners. In April of 1915 came the gas attack near Ypres when the Canadians made their spectacular stand. The book concludes with a eulogy of their bravery.

L. A. L.

Rise of ecclesiastical control in Quebec. By Walter Alexander Riddell, Ph.D., director of social surveys for the Methodist and Presbyterian churches, Canada. [Studies in history, economics and public law, edited by the faculty of political science of Columbia university, whole no. 174, vol. LXIIV, no. 1] (New York: Columbia university press, London: P. S. King & son, limited, 1916. 195 p. $1.75 net)

Mr. Riddell's doctoral thesis concerns itself with the causes that have induced "the present position of unparalleled ecclesiastical control in Quebec." He seeks these causes in the earliest history of the French in North America. Studying the origins of the early immigrants he finds that, despite the fact that they came from many provinces and regions of France, they rapidly acquired in Canada a homogeneity and

a social solidarity that has never been broken under the long rule of the English. In truth it was the English conquest that stabilized and conserved the French-Canadian isolation and homogeneity, by closing the door to new French immigrants, and by increasing rather than diminishing the power and authority of the Catholic hierarchy. This seems to us is the real contribution of the book, and in large measure explains why with Gallicanism dominating the church in the old world, the French community in the new world became stationary rather than progressive.

In his study of the development of the French-Canadian community in the seventeenth century the author has stressed the elements that make for homogeneity, and somewhat blurred the forces of individualism and initiative. It is true he discusses the influence of the fur trade and of the wilderness wandering upon the inhabitants of New France; but he is inclined to minimize the numbers affected, and to believe that the major part of the community lived exclusively on the soil. For example on pages 54 to 56 of his monograph, in studying the comparative numbers engaged in fur trading and agriculture, he omits to consider the interchangeable nature of these occupations, that the farmer of the summer was the *coureur des bois* of the winter, that the most adventurous trader of one year became the landed *seigneur* of the next, and that in such conditions census figures do not tell the whole story. Take for instance the case of Louis Jolliet, one of the first generation of Canadian-born colonists. His wandering years were brief; after 1673 he never returned to the great west he had done so much to explore, but became a farmer and fisher on his estate at Anticosti.

Nor did the conditions of forest ranging change or diminish after the British conquest; hence one cannot agree with the author when he speaks of the "decline of the fur trade" after the coming of the English. Not even in a limited sense did the opportunities for the French population in the fur trade decrease. Many of the merchants of the great companies were of French descent, and practically all the rank and file of the engagés and voyageurs were French-Canadians. Moreover the trade in the latter years of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth grew to such proportions that scarcely a family in all the province of Quebec was unrepresented by a western exile.

Such considerations, however, do not affect the main purpose of the book. When Mr. Riddell begins his study of the relations between church and state, his careful thoroughness and his mastery of the materials yield valuable results. He shows the powerful influence of Bishop Laval in placing the Canadian church in direct relation to the papacy, despite the secularizing tendencies of the Count de Frontenac

and many of his supporters. He proves that the power and authority of the Canadian bishops were successfully maintained during the remainder of the French régime, and he demonstrates that the British authorities by excluding foreign priests perpetuated ecclesiastical control until legal status was given the church under the Quebec act of 1774 and the act of separation of 1791.

Thus the two races and religions were set apart, contact with modern France was broken, the Catholic church became directly responsible to the papacy, and Quebec became in a measure isolated from the currents of modern life.

Today the British in Canada are reaping the harvest they have sown; while the heroic French of Europe are battling for world liberty, French-Canadians hold aloof, untouched by the motives and the idealism that rule their compeers. Mr. Riddell's study has thus a peculiar timeliness, and as the necessity of "Canadianizing" the earliest inhabitants of Canada is more and more clearly seen by Canadian authorities, the value is appreciated of comprehensive study of the factors that produced the present conditions.

L. P. K.

A first book in American history with European beginnings. By Gertrude Van Duyn Southworth. (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1917. 431 p. $.80)

In her preface the author states quite clearly that this book is meant to cover the field of history outlined by the committee of eight for the sixth grade. It is also stated that "the author of this book has met the essential requirements of the Committee of Eight." The way in which this has been done may be judged from the fact that only 87 pages, less than one-fourth of the book, are devoted to the topics outlined by the committee for sixth grade work. The remainder is purely American history, largely biographical, but including all of the important topics usually taught in the seventh and eighth grades through the civil war. From this point the text leaps in two final chapters to George Dewey and Thomas Edison.

Is the condensation of Greek history within the compass of eight pages, or of Roman history within sixteen pages, meeting "the essential requirements of the Committee of Eight?" If so, when and where are children to learn what is meant by "the culture of Greece," the "wonderful temples and public buildings," the amphitheatres and "elaborate palaces," the religious rites, sculpture, painting, and literature of Greece — all of which are mentioned but not described? Will half a dozen brief sentences (pp. 21-22) suffice to plant in children's minds adequate ideas of Greek and Roman religion? What will a

twelve year old child learn from this sentence, descriptive of one phase of mediaeval life: "Nearly all learning was confined to the church, which, closely united to the state, had become a great power?" Teachers well know that concrete conceptions of things utterly new and very distant are not built up in children's minds merely by the use of the terms quoted above.

After the condensed sketch of European history, the rest of the story is the usual elementary American history, written from the traditional standpoint, emphasizing political and military topics, and including all the picturesque incidents that are supposed to be the heritage of American youth. Even the relations between colonists and British are presented with the colonial bias; under the navigation laws, the colonies were not allowed "to carry on trade with any countries other than England and her possessions"; the revenue to be raised by the stamp act was help to pay England's debt incurred in previous wars.

The book may be useful for reference purposes in the seventh and eighth grades, but its use in the sixth grade would be a complete denial of both the plan and the method recommended by the committee of eight.

ALBERT H. SANFORD

NEWS AND COMMENTS

In the death of Herbert Levi Osgood, September 11, 1918, at Brentwood, New York, the historical profession has sustained a serious loss. At the age of 63 Professor Osgood was one of the oldest members of the faculty of political science of Columbia university where he served in the department of history for a period of twenty-eight years. Besides articles on historical and economic subjects which he contributed to the *Political science quarterly* and to the annual reports of the American historical association, Professor Osgood was the author of an intensive study in two volumes (1904) entitled *The American colonies in the seventeenth century*. This work showed a keen realization of the importance of aggressive research in the field of British empirial organization; and, while it took some time for Mr. Osgood to realize the full significance of the pioneer work that he had performed, it led him to plan a study continuing his researches into the eighteenth century phases of colonial relations. In this way, though not the founder of a new school of history, Mr. Osgood won a most honorable place in the historical guild.

Because of conditions induced by the war the committee of the American historical association in charge of the military history prize has decided not to hold the contest this year. Notice of the competition will be given at some future date. On account of the departure of Major R. M. Johnston for France, Mr. Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., of the University of Louisiana, has been made chairman of the committee, while the vacancy has been filled by the appointment of Frank Maloy Anderson of Dartmonth college.

The French government has recently established a Bibliothéque et Musée de la Guerre, intended to hold all the material that will be needed by future historians of the great conflict. M. Adolphe Cohn has been commissioned to collect for shipment to France all material which has emanated from American sources not only since the entrance of the United States into the conflict but since the beginning of the war in August, 1914.

Readers of the Review who have in their possession material of value to future historians, newspaper clippings, posters, back numbers of daily papers, circulars of patriotic societies, would favor M. Cohn by communicating with him at his office in Columbia university.

The Louisiana university and agricultural and mechanical college have issued *The Honor Roll* — a list of six hundred forty-two of their men now in service.

James E. Winston, of the University of Mississippi, has accepted the chair of history at Newcomb college, Tulane university, New Orleans.

In Ohio Governor James M. Cox has appointed an historical commission of which Arthur M. Schlesinger is chairman. The commission collects documents, photographs, and printed matter of all kinds that disclose the work of civilian war agencies, as well as the work of Ohio men and women in active service abroad.

The commission has its headquarters in the archaeological museum at the Ohio state university and after six months has a large collection of records, camp papers, cartoons, and posters as well as a series of one hundred photographs portraying life at Camp Sherman.

August 12, Dan E. Clark of the Iowa state historical society entered home service work at Camp Dodge, Iowa, where he will be stationed indefinitely.

Ernest Alanson Balch, of Kalamazoo college, is now in France serving in the front lines as a Y. M. C. A. secretary with the French troops.

D. C. Shilling of Monmouth college has been granted a year's leave of absence and is at present engaged in Y. M. C. A. work at Camp Sherman, Chillicothe, Ohio.

John H. Latané has been acting as chairman of the educational committee of the Maryland council of defense and is in charge of a statewide campaign which is being carried on by the committee.

Frederick L. Paxson of the University of Wisconsin has been appointed historical expert with the rank of major on the general staff at Washington.

Evarts Boutell Greene, who for the past year has been serving as chairman of the National committee for historical service in Washington, early in September returned to the University of Illinois to resume his duties as head of the department of history.

Lieutenant Theodore Calvin Pease, until December, 1917, connected with the University of Illinois, has since that time been serving with the American expeditionary forces in France.

A full and well tabulated discussion of "The food supply of Russia," by Henry C. Sherman, an illuminating analysis of "Irregular voting in

the United States," by A. C. Millspaugh, and a suggestive sketch of the "Characteristics of President Cleveland," by Charles R. Lingley are published in the June, 1918, *Political science quarterly.*

In the May, 1918, issue of the *Hispanic-American historical review* appears William R. Manning's "An early diplomatic controversy between the United States and Brazil," and Percy Alvin Martin's "The influence of the United States on the opening of the Amazon to the world's commerce." In the same number Herbert E. Bolton publishes with an introduction two interesting documents revealing the versatile "General James Wilkinson as advisor to Emperor Iturbe."

The leading article in the *Catholic historical review* for July, 1918, is "Catholic explorers and pioneers of Illinois," from the days of Marquette to those of Father Gibault, by J. B. Culemans.

To memorialize the part played by Catholics in the hundred years of Illinois statehood was the immediate reason for the launching of the *Illinois Catholic historical review* in July, 1918. In order fitly to achieve that purpose a larger aim is held — to bring forth from their storehouses a wealth of documents, records, and data in order that the unwritten story of Catholic achievement in the middle west — of the church from Marquette's day to our own — may find its place in history.

The *Illinois Catholic historical review* is to be issued quarterly by the Illinois Catholic historical society, under the editorship of Joseph J. Thompson; with him are associated Frederick Beuckman, J. B. Culemans, Kate Meade, and Francis J. Epstein. Among the contributions in the first number are "Early Catholicity in Chicago," by Gilbert J. Garraghan, "Illinois missions," by Joseph J. Thompson, "Civil and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Illinois," by Frederick Beuckman, "A Calendar of historical dates and events," by Kate Meade, and "A Chronology of missions and churches in Illinois," by Catherine Schaefer.

To the *Military historian and economist* for July, 1918, Admiral Degouy contributes "The Americans in Europe," Roberto Michels "Woman labor in Italian Munition factories," and H. B. Richard "The Azores."

Those delightfully human "Jones papers," with "Letters of William Byrd, First," "Virginia gleanings in England," and "Virginia state troops in the revolution" are continued in both the April and July, 1918, issues of the *Virginia Magazine of history and biography.*

"A selected bibliography and syllabus of the history of the south, 1584-1876" compiled by William K. Boyd and Robert P. Brooks has been published as the June, 1918, *Bulletin of the University of Georgia.*

The July, 1918, issue of the *Ohio archeological and historical quarterly* is devoted to the "Indian in Ohio," by H. C. Shetrone, who purposes that in it the average reader may find a briefly comprehensive resumé of Ohio aboriginal history.

The Indiana historical commission has just completed a carefully prepared index of the Vincennes *Sun,* down to 1825, covering the files while the state capital was at Vincennes and Corydon. The commission has ready for press a complete history of the Indiana centennial year activities.

The University of Indiana has recently collected the speeches of Senator O. P. Morton, of Joseph E. McDonold, of David Turpie, and of Thomas A. Hendricks.

In the June, 1918, *Indiana magazine of history* are "Some reminiscences of James Whitcomb Riley," by George S. Cottman, "A historical sketch of Pell City," by Will Maurer, "Diary of the Mexican war," by Thomas Bailey, and the completion of J. Edward Murr's "Lincoln in Indiana."

A sketch of the spirited "Colonel Elmer E. Ellsworth: first hero of the civil war," by Charles A. Ingraham, and the story of "The Paul Revere print of the Boston massacre," by Louise P. Kellogg appear in the June, 1918, *Wisconsin magazine of history.*

"Thomas Lippincott, a pioneer of 1818, and his diary," edited by Charles H. Rammelkamp appears in the July, 1917, *Journal of the Illinois state historical society.*

"Lincoln and the presidential election of 1864," by Arthur C. Cole, "Illinois and the underground railroad to Canada," by Verna Cooley, and "The movement of the population of Illinois, 1870-1910," by Ernest L. Bogart appear in the 1917 *Transactions of the Illinois state historical society.*

"Social and economic effects of the civil war with special reference to Minnesota," comprizes the May, 1918, number of the *Minnesota history bulletin.* Therein Lester Burrell Shippee points out change, expansion, and growth in specific economic and social fields; sets forth the results of war upon public morality — a social cataclysm which "stirs the mud in the depths of the pool"; and indicates the release of a disposition to reëstimate all social values.

"Iowa war proclamations" issued by Governor W. L. Harding between April 6, 1917, and July 1, 1918, and "An Iowa flag," Ruth A. Gallaher's account of recent efforts to secure the adoption of a state em-

blem, comprize respectively the July and August, 1918, issues of *Iowa and the war.*

"Frontier defense in Iowa, 1850-1865," by Dan E. Clark, "The ages of soldiers in the civil war," by W. W. Gist, and the "Influence of wheat and cotton on Anglo-American relations during the civil war," appear in the July, 1918, *Iowa journal of history and politics.*

The Nebraska state historical society has recently undertaken the publication of *Nebraska history and record of pioneer days.* It is an eight page quarto monthly, under the editorship of Addison E. Sheldon; associated with him are the staffs of the society and the legislative reference bureau.

The sweep and dash of Texas cowboys off to battle is vigorously recreated by J. K. P. Blackburn in "Reminiscences of the Terry rangers"; the first installment appears in the July, 1918, *Southwestern historical quarterly* along with William Lytle Schurz's "Acapulco and the Manila galleon," and Eugene C. Barker's "Stephen F. Austin" which is reprinted from the Mississippi Valley Historical Review for June, 1918.

An "Historical sketch of Governor William Carr Lane together with the diary of his journey from St. Louis, Mo., to Santa Fe, N. M., July 31st, to September 9th, 1852," with annotations by Ralph E. Twitchell makes up number 4 of the publications of the Historical society of New Mexico.

The Washington university state historical society has recently received the extensive diaries of Winfield Scott Ebey. They comprise twelve volumes and extend from 1854 to 1863 — a pioneer record of great value to the students of northwestern history and in particular of the Puget sound region.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. V, NO. 3 DECEMBER, 1918

ANDREW JOHNSON AND THE EARLY PHASES OF THE HOMESTEAD BILL[1]

In the Earl of Durham's "Report upon the affairs of British North America," published in the *Parliamentary papers* for 1839, the problems of public lands and emigration were taken under consideration, and the following judgment, by way of comparison with conditions in Canada, was expressed as to the administration of the public domain of the United States.

"The system of the United States appears to combine all the chief requisites of the greatest efficiency. It is uniform throughout the vast federation; it is unchangeable save by Congress and never has been materially altered; it renders the acquisition of new land easy, and yet, by means of a price, restricts appropriation to the actual wants of the settler; it is so simple as to be readily understood; it provides for accurate surveys and against needless delays; it gives an instant and secure title; and it admits of no favoritism, but distributes the public property among all classes and persons upon precisely equal terms. That system has promoted an amount of immigration and settlement of which the history of the world affords no other example, and it has produced to the United States a revenue which has averaged about a half-million sterling per annum, and which has amounted in one twelve months to about four million sterling or more than the whole expenditure of the federal government."[2]

[1] This paper was the presidential address read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association at St. Paul, May 9, 1918.

[2] "Reports on the affairs of British North America from the Earl of Durham, Her Majesty's high commissioner," in *Parliamentary papers*, session of 1839, 17: 74.

In contrast with the very favorable opinion of the British commissioner may be cited another, which likewise had its origin from without the limits of the United States. In a letter addressed to his brother-in-law, James F. Perry, in March, 1830, Stephen F. Austin, then colonizing Texas under the jurisdiction of the Mexican government, wrote as follows:

"We have nothing to fear from this [the Mexican] govt. nor from any other quarter except from the United States of the north. If that govt. should get hold of us and introduce its *land* system, etc., etc., thousands who are now on the move and who have not yet secured their titles would be totally ruined. The greatest misfortune that could befall Texas at this moment would be a sudden change by which any of the emigrants would be thrown upon the liberality of the Congress of the United States of the North. *Theirs would be a most forlorn hope.*"[3]

These strongly opposing comments of the thirties illustrate respectively two points of view of great significance in the history of the public lands of the United States: the point of view of the thickly settled, capitalistic part of the country, and the point of view of the frontier. The clashing of these two points of view goes back to very early times in the history of America, and an understanding of the controverted issues is essential to the purpose of this paper.

In the fateful years which brought to a close the exercise of authority in America by the British government there was manifest a vivid contrast between the actualities of American life and the plans of the British ministry. This was true particularly of the system of granting lands in those colonies which were under the direct control of the crown. Among the arguments which found the support of government was that which urged the danger of depopulating Great Britain and Ireland through emigration. The fear was expressed that if colonial population in America increased, manufactures would start up in the possessions to the detriment of British interests. On the other hand it was pointed out that to restrict to the region east of the moun-

The passage was cited by Senator Felch of Michigan, *Congressional globe*, 31 congress, 2 session, appendix, 103 ff.

[3] Stephen F. Austin to James F. Perry, March 28, 1830, in Austin papers, university of Texas. For his kind permission to use this passage, and for bibliographical suggestions, I am indebted to the courtesy of Mr. E. C. Barker.

tains the granting of lands, which had been the policy of the government since 1763, might bring about in the east a density of population that would render more likely the development of colonial manufactures, while the opening of the west to free settlement would prevent this danger. In 1774, the British government put into effect a new land policy which looked towards the definite end of procuring, by a system of surveys and sales, an increased revenue from the lands subject to disposition by the king. That the establishment of the new regulations as to surveys and sales came too late and that the system could not be put into effect was the opinion of many of the royal officials. That it was unwise Burke maintained in his famous speech on conciliation with America. That it was illegal was the theory of Thomas Jefferson, whose "Summary view" contains a somewhat antiquarian but none the less radical argument as to the limitation of the king's right to determine at all the conditions of granting land in America. Meanwhile, in direct antithesis to the new royal policy was the hard fact that already men were swarming over the mountains into the Ohio valley and seating themselves upon the land, with a title if they could get one, without a title if they could not.[4]

The contrasts which have been suggested — the opposition between the policy of financial gain and the practical issue of rapid settlement, the effort to control by a system the conflicting interests of different regions, and the misunderstanding of one region by another — very shortly reappeared in full intensity both in the new states which had lands to administer and in the public domain which resulted from the cessions of claims of states to the United States; and in the public domain, particularly, these disputes and difficulties continued for many generations. The earlier phases of this development may here be passed over.[5] Between sections and leaders there developed of

[4] The land policy of the British government in its many phases, with the closely related topics of Indian relations and transmontane settlement, has received exhaustive treatment in the recent work of Clarence W. Alvord, *The Mississippi valley in British politics: a study of the trade, land speculation, and experiments in imperialism culminating in the American revolution* (Cleveland, 1917). A general reference may likewise be made to Miss Amelia C. Ford's *Colonial precedents of our national land system as it existed in 1800* ([Madison], 1910).

[5] Thomas Donaldson, *The public domain: its history, with statistics, with references to the national domain, colonization, acquirement of territory, the survey, ad-*

necessity plans of compromise, and, beginning with the period of the thirties, we may notice briefly three policies laid before the American people.

There was, first, the scheme of Henry Clay, — to sell the lands in the west at a price, and to distribute the greater part of the net proceeds from the sales of these lands among all the states of the union. This plan, dear to the whig party and to the eastern manufacturing states in particular, was intimately related in Clay's thought to the desirability of a protective tariff and the undertaking of internal improvements by the federal government. Another plan was that supported by Calhoun, who, abominating both the protective system and internal improvements, wished to lessen also the influence of the federal government through its possession of the land and to this end urged that those parts of the domain which lay within the bounds of organized states should be surrendered to those states. This latter plan was never adopted; but, in combination with other proposals, it made various ghostly appearances long after its most important advocate had passed from the scene. The third scheme of primary importance and of chief interest to the student of western history, was the one with which the name of Thomas Hart Benton is inseparably connected. In this plan there were several elements. Born in a system which presupposed a financial purpose, Benton's plan assumed that the lands in the west were to be sold. But it urged, first, that the occupant or "squatter" who had anticipated the legal sale of the land and settled upon it in violation of law, should be protected and should have the first right to buy at the minimum price. Hence the successive preëmption laws. Secondly, it was Benton's idea that the amount of time for which land that had been offered for sale remained unsold constituted a criterion of the quality of the land. He therefore presented and persistently supported a plan for the graduation and reduction of the price of the unsold lands according to which plan lands that had failed for a certain number of years to sell at the minimum price of

ministration and several methods of sale and disposition of the public domain of the United States (Washington, 1884); Shosuke Sato, *History of the land question in the United States* (Johns Hopkins university *Studies in historical and political science*, fourth series, VII-IX, Baltimore, 1886); Payson J. Treat, *The national land system, 1785-1820* (New York, 1910).

$1.25 per acre should be offered at a less amount. Those not sold at this lower price after another period of time should be offered again at a rate still further reduced. Thirdly, Benton urged that the land which would not sell at all — that which he called "refuse" land — should be *given* free of charge to occupants.[6]

In another place[7] I have endeavored to show to what a great extent these ideas of Benton were derived from the experience of Tennessee, the state in which Benton's earlier political career was cast, the state which though it had technically been *in* the public domain was by force of its peculiar history in relation to North Carolina not *of* it. Here it is unnecessary to elaborate upon this point: but it may be pointed out that just as New Englanders, with New England ideas, spread themselves westward,[8] so both hundreds of people and individual leaders passed out of Tennessee not only into Missouri, but into Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas, and carried with them their ways of looking at things. By way of example one may point to the Seviers and Conways of Arkansas, to Sam Houston of Texas, and to Gwin of California. Moreover, in what we may call the Tennessee régime of the democratic party, the era of Jackson and Polk, the plan of Benton received the support of the national administration.[9] Benton's "log cabin" bill, first brought up in 1824 and expanded in 1826, was unsuccessfully urged for fifteen years, though various stages of preëmption were gone through. Both Jackson and Van Buren, however, approved his plan; and the graduation principle was adopted by the executive in treaties with the Indians where lands were to be sold.[10] In 1841, as an

[6] Raynor G. Wellington, *The political and sectional influence of the public lands, 1828-1842* ([Cambridge], 1914).

[7] St. George L. Sioussat, "Some phases of Tennessee politics in the Jackson period," in *American historical review*, 14: 51.

[8] Lois K. Mathews, *The expansion of New England, the spread of New England settlement and institutions to the Mississippi river, 1620-1865* (Boston, 1909), chs. 1, 6-10.

[9] While Henry Clay consistently opposed Benton's scheme, it received at different times partial support from Daniel Webster. See *Congressional debates*, 4: part 1: 660, 666, 674, and *Works of Daniel Webster* (fifth edition — Boston, 1853), 4: 391 ff., 523 ff; 5: 386. It was James Madison, Webster said, who had called his attention to the importance of the public lands.

[10] Charles J. Kappler, *Indian treaties* (Washington, 1904); Chickasaw, 1832, 2: 359; Chickasaw, 1834, 2: 421-422, Chippewa, 1838, 2: 516-517.

outcome of the whig victory in the election of 1840, a hybrid law was passed[11] which brought into temporary activity Clay's plan of distribution and into permanent force the preëmption part of Benton's scheme.[12] By reason of the peculiar relation of this matter to the whig tariff policy, and because of the grand fiasco which overtook the whigs on the death of General Harrison, the distribution plan automatically ceased and the efforts to bring it into existence again did not succeed though distribution like Calhoun's cession to the states lifted its head at various times thereafter.[13]

For the next two or three years no land measures were enacted comparable to the law of 1841. But in the second congress of Tyler's administration, — the twenty-eighth congress, — which assembled in 1843, there was a democratic house of representatives; and in this congress the plan of graduation and reduction, which in the thirties had been the chief rival of distribution, made its appearance anew. Henceforth, the graduation bill was a hardy annual, until in the session of 1853-1854 it at last became a law.

At least for the earlier part of the Polk administration this bill was pressed as an administration measure. In the first session of the twenty-eighth congress the bill was introduced in the senate by Robert J. Walker of Mississippi and in the house by Houston of Alabama. At this time there was little debate. In the campaign of 1844 the Texas and Oregon questions, with that of the tariff, over-shadowed all others. When the election was over the bill was vigorously debated in the house of representatives.[14] After Polk became president he appointed Shields of Illinois commissioner of the land office, a position which fell within the department of the treasury, the head of which, Robert J. Walker, was a prominent supporter of the graduation plan.[15] When the twenty-ninth congress assembled, Shields in his annual report, Walker in his communication as secretary, and the

[11] Approved September 4, 1841. *United States statutes at large*, 5: 453.

[12] Andrew Jackson, at this time in retirement at the Hermitage, asked his friend F. P. Blair to thank Benton for the log cabin bill. Jackson to F. P. Blair, 1841, 115 Jackson papers, library of congress.

[13] George M. Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands, from 1840 to 1862, from pre-emption to homestead* (Boston, 1917), ch. 6.

[14] *Congressional globe*, 28 congress, 2 session, 21, 50-53, 69-72, 82-84, 240, 248.

[15] Walker is one of those to whom the authorship of the homestead principle has been attributed.

president in his message,[16] all urged the expediency of putting into force at once the graduation of the price of the public lands. Introduced in both houses at the beginning of the session the bill was postponed, but later Breese, chairman of the committee on public lands in the senate, and McClernand, who held a similar position in the house, each pushed the measure.[17] The bill passed the senate by a vote that followed pretty distinctly party lines: the democrats for the bill and the whigs opposing it.[18] This bill was then sent to the house which had been somewhat sharply debating a bill of its own. The house laid aside its own bill and passed the senate bill with amendments by a close vote.[19] The length of the graduation period did not suit the house, so it was sent back to the senate with amendments. The senate tinkered with it further and when it went back to the house the second time it was laid on the table a few days before the close of the session.[20]

An examination of the legislative course of the bill brings out two observations of interest. In the first place, in congress also the bill was claimed as an administration measure. The preceding year, just after the election, McClernand, pleading for the graduation bill, had maintained that the victory of Polk showed that the people demanded the bill.[21] Now Bowlin of Missouri again made this a direct appeal. It was, he said, one of the great issues in the contest of 1844 and stood in contradistinction to the whig scheme of distribution. The people had decided in favor of graduation, the president had brought it before congress. Referring to Texas, Oregon, the tariff and the independent treasury, he said, "The four first great acts of the political drama have been passed. What Democrat is prepared to make a stumbling block of the fifth?"[22] This assertion that the bill was distinctly a party test was not unquestioned,[23] but

[16] The statements of each of the three men may be found, *ibid.*, 29 congress, 1 session, appendix: Polk's message, 7; Walker's, 12; Shields', 39 ff.

[17] *Congressional globe*, 29 congress, 1 session, 45, 86, 953, 967, 988, 1040, 1057 ff. The speech of McClernand of Ohio, July 10, 1846, is in *ibid.*, 29 congress, 2 session, appendix, 33.

[18] *Ibid.*, 29 congress, 1 session, 1073.

[19] *Ibid.*, 1075, 1094.

[20] *Ibid.*, 1195.

[21] *Ibid.*, 28 congress, 2 session, 72.

[22] *Ibid.*, 29 congress, 1 session, 1061-1062.

[23] Remarks of Vinton of Ohio, *ibid.*, 1076.

the votes in both senate and house bear out the general accuracy of the claim. In the second place, however, there developed an important exception to the support of the democratic side which, together with the absence of many members, appears to have been the cause of the final defeat in the house. This was the opposition of many democrats of the eastern states who joined with the whigs:[24] an alignment which had been predicted in the course of the debate. This attitude of the eastern democrats was of course not new; it had been manifest in the controversies of 1838 and 1839. But its reappearance now at the very time of the introduction of the Wilmot proviso is significant. On the other hand it is worthy of note that most of the democrats of the old south, including the South Carolina contingent, were found ranged with those of the southwest and the northwest, in common support of the bill against the whig opposition.[25]

To follow briefly the course of the graduation bill: in the second session of the twenty-ninth congress Polk, besides recommending graduation in his first message, sent in a special message,[26] saying that the enactment of the measure would increase the revenue from the public lands, which was needed for the prosecution of the war with Mexico. The graduation bill was again introduced, but more significant was the effort of the committee on ways and means to embody the graduation principle in a revenue bill.[27] In both forms the proposed legislation failed. Besides other disturbing forces, the absorption of interest by the bounty law of 1847[28] which offered warrants for land to the soldiers and officers of the Mexican war, rendered less likely than before the passage of the graduation bill. The effect of the bounty law naturally was to take from the domain hundreds of thousands of acres. A sharp division between east and west appeared in the insistence on the part of the west that the warrant holders should become settlers, and in the objection

[24] Remarks of Henley, *ibid.*, 1071.

[25] *Ibid.*, 1069, 1073, 1179. In 1837-1839, when Van Buren was urging graduation, the bill passed the senate and failed in the house. Then Calhoun and his followers were in opposition. (Wellington, *The political and sectional influence of the public lands*, 68-73.) Now Calhoun and Benton supported the bill. This makes the more marked the position of the eastern democrats.

[26] *4 Richardson (U. S.)*, 516, February 13, 1847.

[27] *Congressional globe*, 29 congress, 2 session, 440, 536 ff.

[28] *United States statutes at large*, 9: 123; cf. Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands, from 1840 to 1862, from pre-emption to homestead*, ch. 9.

of eastern men that the east should not be depopulated in order that the west might be settled.[29] The bounty act was important not merely for itself but because it initiated the policy of thus granting lands, a policy which was continued through the acts of 1850, 1852, and 1857. The cause of the graduation bill in the thirtieth congress was hopeless, for the whigs controlled the house of representatives. The outstanding feature of these years was an able report by Collamer of Vermont against the graduation policy.[30] When the thirty-first congress met in 1849, although the administration was whig, the democrats regained control of the organization of both houses, and the graduation bill appeared again. Bowlin of Missouri was chairman of the committee on public lands in the house of representatives and Felch of Michigan in charge of the same committee in the senate. In the thirty-second congress, W. P. Hall, a democrat from Missouri, succeeded Bowlin, while Felch continued. The thirty-third congress once more saw both houses of congress and the executive department under democratic control. Dodge of Iowa was chairman of the senate committee and Disney of Ohio chairman of that of the house. In the first session of this congress the graduation and reduction bill became law.

Like most of the land measures that were proposed, the plan of graduation and reduction was in reality an effort to effect a compromise between the principle of revenue and the interests of the actual settlers. The same statement may be made as to the concession of the right of preëmption, particularly as embodied in the act of 1841. Under this law and those which had preceded it, the settler was favored in that he had the right to buy at the lowest government price. The government, however, received a revenue from the land though this revenue was diminished by the difference between the minimum price and that which the land might have brought at auction. The settlers were dissatisfied with the act of 1841; they asked for a general prospective preëmption which should apply to the unsurveyed public domain as well as to that which had been surveyed, or for an extension of the time for making payments on preëmpted lands. The latter concession, if granted, would have been equivalent to a reëstablishment, in part, of the former credit system.[31]

[29] Remarks of Perry of Maryland, *Congressional globe*, 29 congress, 2 session, 254.

[30] *Reports of the house of representatives*, 30 congress, 1 session, no. 732.

[31] Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands, from 1840 to 1862, from pre-*

But the demand had been heard for more than this, for more than a mere compromise. That the government should give land outright to actual settlers and surrender entirely the seeking of revenue, was no new idea. The head rights of Virginia and other colonies were a precedent of sufficient antiquity, and many gifts had been made by the government of the United States to individuals.[32] A distinction must be drawn, however, between free gifts of land to actual settlers, either those already seated or prospective occupants, and grants of lands that involved some service rendered in return. This will serve to distinguish the real homestead grant from the many forms of bounties given for military service or some return to the government which might be considered a fair compensation. Thus, as far back as 1840 the settlers in Oregon had petitioned for donations of land,[33] and ten years later, after much debate, such grants were made.[34] In the meantime similar gifts were made to settlers in Florida.[35] In both these cases it was considered that a special return was rendered to the government either because the recipients were holding the ground in so distant a region as Oregon or because they were acting as a defense against the Indians, as in Florida. The multiform grants to the states were likewise justified upon a theory of compensation.[36] But the homestead plan asked the government to give away the public lands and sacrifice all direct revenue therefrom at a time when the settlement of the west was no longer uncertain. However strong the arguments for homesteads was it was not the advantage to the government that was the most convincing.

Having made this distinction between the homestead idea and the grant for military or other service, I wish to attempt a sim-

emption to homestead, 97-103. Cf. many petitions to congress in House of representatives papers (manuscripts), in library of congress, packages marked "Wisconsin public lands," 1843-1847, 1845-1848.

[32] Ford, *Colonial precedents of our national land system as it existed in 1800*, ch. 6; Treat, *The national land system, 1785-1820*, ch. 12.

[33] *Senate documents*, 26 congress, 1 session, 514; *Congressional globe*, 26 congress, 1 session, 60, 103, 296.

[34] Act approved September 27, 1850. *United States statutes at large*, 9: 496 ff.

[35] Act of August 4, 1842. *Ibid.*, 5: 502.

[36] Matthias N. Orfield, *Federal land grants to the states with special reference to Minnesota* (Minneapolis, 1915). See also Treat, *The national land system, 1785-1820*, ch. 11.

ilar delimitation between the strict homestead of good land and Benton's idea, which persisted throughout the following period, of giving to actual settlers either directly or through the states the "refuse" land. This was one part of the "log cabin" bill. The idea, no doubt, found a special development in Tennessee where occupants or squatters had settled upon poor lands or odd bits of land not covered by North Carolina warrants. In the federal land system Benton wished to make provision for those unable to buy at the land sales even after the price had been graduated and reduced. As to Tennessee the idea was pressed in congress by David Crockett, in opposition to the rest of the Tennessee delegation, who asked permission to sell refuse lands in Tennessee for the benefit of schools. Finally these lands were given to Tennessee.[37]

A somewhat different phenomenon appeared in another southwestern state. In his *Biographical and pictorial history of Arkansas*, Hallum[38] claims that the origin of the homestead policy goes back to Governor E. N. Conway of Arkansas, at one time federal auditor. It appears that but few soldiers settled on the lands granted to them in Arkansas and these lands were sold by the state for nonpayment of taxes. The burden of the back taxes was sometimes so large that no one would buy the lands, and they remained on the hands of the state. In 1840 Conway recommended that "a law be passed donating to every individual who would settle upon and improve a quarter section of such land, the right of the state thereto, conditioned that the taxes afterwards accruing upon the land thus occupied should be regularly paid, or the land and improvements thereon should revert to the state and remain subject to private sale." "Were such a law passed," he continued, "and the lands thus donated, whilst held under such titles *only,* exempted from execution of sale for any other debts than state and county taxes, it is the humble opinion of the auditor that the military district would in a few years be greatly improved and the revenue augmented. Persons not wishing to avail themselves of the benefits of such a law should be allowed as they now are, to purchase at private sales, lands which had once been offered at public

[37] *Ibid.*, 353.

[38] John Hallum, *Biographical and pictorial history of Arkansas* (Albany, 1887), 55.

auction by the auditor and remained unused and not donated."[39]

Two years later Conway reported to the assembly that many persons had availed themselves of the benefits of the law[40] passed by the last legislature, so that "some of these wild lands heretofore uninhabited, uncultivated and producing no revenue have become changed to the home of industrious and enterprising persons who settled, improved, and will cultivate them."

With due local pride Hallum says that Conway's recommendation was copied by the press of every state in the union and commendatory letters were received by him from many persons of authority. He concludes that Andrew Johnson, "the greatest of national humbugs," appropriated the idea. In deferring judgment on this opinion we may recall that Conway, like Benton, was a representative of the westward emigration from Tennessee.

But the most impressive example of a liberal land policy was brought to the attention of the frontiersmen of the United States through the settlement of Texas across the southwestern border. The impresario Stephen F. Austin gave especial care to the establishment of a land system. His original proposals to the Spanish governor of Texas looked to grants of a moderate size, but the colonization law of January 4, 1823, under which, on February 18 of the same year, the Emperor Iturbide approved Austin's petition to settle three hundred families, vastly augmented the grants to be made to settlers. Austin was empowered to grant headrights of a league (4,428 acres) of

[39] State of Arkansas, *House journal*, 1840, p. 27.

[40] *Ibid.*, 1842, appendix, 20. The act is in *Laws of Arkansas*, 1840, 60 ff. From a memorial of the state of Arkansas to congress, approved December 16, 1838, may be cited the following passage, which excellently illustrates the western point of view. The assembly was urging the passage of a general preëmption law. "The pioneer of the western wilds is not a lawless intruder, who settles upon the lands of the government with the unrighteous design of robbing the public and obtaining by trespass a claim against the government. He is in truth the greatest benefactor of the public. Had it not been for his adventurous and daring spirit, had no man ever settled upon the public lands until he had purchased it, civilization would not at this day have reached the Mississippi, and the fairest part of our land would still remain an unsettled wilderness. The wealthy, those who have the means to purchase their thousands of acres of the government, those who have the capital to interest in labor, and the means to open extensive farms and plantations, are not the men to penetrate the wilderness. The pioneer must first, with his axe and rifle, open the path. The country must be somewhat settled before there arises any demand for the public lands."

grazing lands and a *labór* (177 acres) of farming lands to each head of a family; while impresarios who brought in settlers were to receive 66,774 acres for every two hundred families. With the severest exertion Austin managed to retain his privileges through the uncertain course of Mexican politics. Within his colony there was difficulty over the charge of twelve and one-half cents an acre which Austin insisted on writing into his contracts, though his grant from the government made no reference to such payments. This small fee Austin felt to be necessary and just, because otherwise he would receive nothing to cover the cost of the careful surveys and records which he made, together with his requirement of the proof of the good character of intending settlers, essential parts of his plan of colonization.

With the military phases which of necessity marked the Texas revolution, the plan of bounties which had been so prominent a feature in the United States made its appearance. By the constitution adopted in 1836, all persons living in the republic at the time of the declaration of independence were to be considered citizens, and anyone who had not received his portion of land could claim, if a head of a family, a league and a *labór,* or if a single man, one-third of a league. By legislation the headright system was extended to later volunteers in the revolution. In 1837 a land office was established with a series of minute regulations. Various "prices" were attached to the fulfillment of these grants, but as these ran from one dollar and fifty cents to seven dollars for a *labór* of 177 acres, it is evident that the land was practically given away. In 1839 immigrants were offered smaller amounts, 640 acres to heads of families, and half that to single men, conditioned on three years of residence. Later there was superadded the requirement that ten acres of land must be cultivated, and the locations surveyed and marked. Such were the opportunities to acquire lands in Texas in the forties.[41]

[41] For the development of the land system of Texas see D. C. Wooten, *Comprehensive history of Texas, 1685-1897* (Dallas, 1898), 1: 784-848; and for the earlier period — that of Austin's management — two papers by Eugene C. Barker, "The government of Austin's colony, 1821-1831," in *Southwestern historical quarterly,* 21: 223-252, and "Stephen F. Austin," in MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW, 5: 20-35. The laws may be studied in *Laws of Texas, 1822-1905,* edited by Hans P. N. Gammell (Austin, 1898-1904); John and Henry Sayles, *Early laws of Texas* (St. Louis, 1888); and James W. Dallam, *A digest of the laws of Texas, containing*

It may fairly be claimed, then, that western experience and traditions made entirely intelligible the request that land be given to the actual settler without the demand of a price, and that there would be no difficult transition from Benton's proposed gift of poor land to that which promised to the settler the best land, however much opposed to the revenue policy the latter might be. Thus there was a distinctly western origin or approach to the homestead bill. But, while this might easily have commanded the votes of all the senators and representatives of those states which still retained the characteristics of the frontier, or whose ties with the frontier remained particularly close, it would never have succeeded in overcoming the financial hostility both of the eastern states and of those states originally western that through denser settlement and the occupation of all their good lands were likely to become more and more disposed toward the eastern point of view. As to the western origin of the homestead legislation, one finds, as might be expected, that this measure had its beginning in association with the bill for graduating and reducing the price of the public lands and that this association was a necessary one. But it remains to be seen how men of the east who consistently opposed graduation and reduction came over, at least on the part of considerable groups, to the active support of the homestead bill.

In the spring of 1844 a group of individuals who described themselves as the central committee of the "National reform association" addressed a letter to James K. Polk, as a "candidate for public office" to solicit an expression of his views on a subject which, they thought, vitally affected the rights and interests of their constituents. They proceeded to say,

"We see this singular condition of affairs: that, while wealth in our country is rapidly accumulating; while internal improvements of every description are fast increasing, and while machinery has multiplied the power of production to an immense extent; yet, with all these *national* advantages, *the compensation for useful labor is getting less and less.* We seek the cause of this anomaly, and we trace it to the monopoly of the land, which places *labor* at the mercy of *capital.* We therefore desire to abolish the monopoly, not by interfering with the conventional

a full and complete compilation of the land laws together with the opinions of the supreme court from 1840 to 1844 inclusive (Austin, 1904).

rights of persons now in possession of the land, but by arresting the further sale of all lands not yet appropriated as private property, and by allowing these lands hereafter to be freely occupied by those who may choose to settle on them. We propose that the Public Lands hereafter shall not be *owned,* but *occupied* only, the occupant having the right to sell or otherwise dispose of *improvements* to any one not in possession of other land; so that, by preventing *any* individual from becoming possessed of more than a limited quantity, *every* one may enjoy the right.

"This measure, we think, would gradually establish an equilibrium between the agricultural and other useful occupations, that would insure to all full employment and fair compensation for their labor, on the lands now held as private property; and to each individual on the public lands the right to work for himself on his premises, or for another, at his option."[42]

In the brief endorsement—"not worthy of an answer"—which Polk made upon this document, one senses immediately his feeling that this was a radicalism not to be encouraged. But to students of economic history the development of the labor movement in the United States and the radical doctrines of the land reformers of the eastern states have formed an inviting field for investigation. As this field has been thoroughly exploited by Mr. John R. Commons and his associates, both in the *Documentary history of American industrial society* and very recently in the *History of labour in the United States,* we need here only with great brevity recall the increasing activity, in the midst of a sharply pressing conflict of wages and prices, of the labor movement of the second quarter of the nineteenth century, and the influence, in the propagation of a doctrine of land reform,[43] of such men, largely of English and Irish extrac-

[42] Polk papers, library of congress, vol. 56. The letter, dated at New York, April 20, 1844, was signed by eight persons, among whom were George H. Evans and Lewis Masquerier.

[43] The earlier agrarian movement is discussed by Miss Helen L. Sumner in John R. Commons and associates, *History of labour in the United States* (New York, 1918), 1: 234 ff. There was also a land reform group of German origin, of whom the leading spirit was Herman Kriege. Henry E. Hoagland, *ibid.,* 1: 534-535. See also *Documentary history of American industrial society,* edited by John R. Commons and associates (Cleveland, 1910-1911), 7: 310-312, for documents illustrating the attitude of the German group in 1845.

tion, as Thomas Skidmore, Thomas Spence, George Henry Evans, and Thomas Ainge Devyr.

When to the feeble presses started by these radicals of the east there was added as the medium of a convert the great newspaper of Horace Greeley, the cause of land reform was much advanced. The decade of the forties was a decade of "isms," of which Horace Greeley was the prophet. As Mr. Commons pointedly expresses it, "He was the *Tribune* of the people, the spokesman of their discontent, the champion of their nostrums. He drew the line only at spirit rappings and free love."[44]

Upon Greeley's mind, as upon a sensitive receptive apparatus, there played idealistic influences from two distinct sources. The one, which we may call applied transcendentalism, came from Massachusetts, and now endeavored to realize itself in such experiments as Brook Farm, in 1842. After the next year, the representatives of this group identified themselves with the interest of the working people, and about the same time, took up Brisbane's Americanization of the social philosophy of Fourier, and proceeded to the organization of phalanxes with an enthusiasm worthy of a more successful cause.[45] The other current which influenced Greeley came from the workingmen. Thomas Spence, an English net-maker, wrote a book advocating that "all the land of England should be leased and the proceeds divided equally among all the people of England." Spence's ideas exerted some influence upon the first workingmen's party of New York. But the man who more completely interested the working classes in the land question was another Englishman by the name of George Henry Evans, who came to America in time to undergo apprenticeship as a printer, and who, in 1829, began the *Working Man's Advocate.* Evans was a philosopher who believed in the "natural right of all men to land, just as to sunlight, air and water." As a landless class, the workingmen of the east were slaves to a master class which owned their means of livelihood. Land reform, he urged, must precede the abolition of negro slavery.

[44] *Ibid.*, 7: introduction, 20. This introduction is a reprint of Mr. Commons' article, "Horace Greeley and the working class origins of the republican party," in *Political science quarterly*, 24: no. 3. Examples of Greeley's editorials are given in *Documentary history of American industrial society* (Commons and associates ed.), 8: 40-44.

[45] *Ibid.*, 7: introduction, 26-28.

Evans differed from the communists in his emphasis upon the individual right to the soil. The panic of 1837 gave a temporary setback to the labor movement. When more encouraging times appeared, Evans resurrected his paper under the name of *Young America* and organized a party known as the national reformers. To this propaganda belongs the celebrated pamphlet "Vote yourself a farm," which, with many other very interesting documents bearing on this period, Mr. Commons has reprinted in the *Documentary history of American industrial society.*[46] Between 1844 and 1848 the agitation of the land reformers made great strides, assisted by the attention which the anti-rent riots in New York state called to this particular issue.[47]

The work was aggressively pushed by the "industrial con-

[46] *Ibid.*, 7: introduction, 29-33. See also *ibid.*, 7: 288 ff. for important documents. Some account of Evans is given by Hoagland in Commons and associates, *History of labour in the United States*, 1: 522 ff.

[47] Besides the work of Mr. Commons and his associates there may be consulted also the older book of Rudolf E. Meyer, *Heimstätten- und andere Wirtschaftsgesetze der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, von Canada, Russland, China, Indien, Rumänien, Serbien und England* (Berlin, 1883); and Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands, from 1840 to 1862, from pre-emption to homestead*, 103-113. The Van Buren manuscripts in the library of congress contain many important letters, especially in relation to the campaign of 1848; see particularly Van Buren's reply to the Buffalo convention, 56 Van Buren manuscripts.

In connection with this subject, some interest attaches to a group of letters which, several years later, Andrew Johnson received from Thomas Ainge Devyr, one of the most prominent of the land reformers. Devyr wrote from Williamsburg, New York, on December 9, 1859, giving Johnson a sketch of the history of the "land reformers" organized in New York in 1844. These were nearly all democrats. Devyr had conducted a democratic paper at Williamsburg at the time. The democratic party proved hostile; the Greeley whigs made a show of favoring land reform, and so did the Buffalo platform men. Those imposters, wrote Devyr, "stole our thunder" in 1848, and took nineteen-twentieths of those devoted to the cause. "Ours" was the free soil party up to that time. Now (1859), Devyr urged the democrats to take the matter up again. Devyr added an interesting account of his own history; twenty-three years before, he had published in the north of Ireland a pamphlet reprinted here, and in the chartist movement he had "narrowly" escaped to the United States, in 1840. Upon the back of the letter cited Andrew Johnson wrote "Not read as yet." On January 1, 1860, Devyr wrote again, sending a printed circular. A third letter followed January 8, in which the writer interestingly connects the homestead agitation with the anti-rent difficulies in New York. Devyr wrote a fourth time January 21, addressing Johnson as "general-in-chief" of the cause, and saying that he was unwilling to ascribe the neglect of his letters to deliberate intention. Johnson-Patterson manuscripts in the possession of Mr. A. J. Patterson, of Greenville, Tennessee, to whom acknowledgment is made for the permission to consult these papers. Some account of Devyr is given by Hoagland in Commons and associates, *History of labour in the United States*, 1: 532.

gress,'' of which the sessions, beginning in 1845, were held each year.[48] But the most widely heard voice continued to be that of Greeley.

It is hardly necessary to point out the great difference between these ideas and those of Benton. If logically carried out the principles of Evans justified the taking of land from monopolists in any part of the world. It was only America's fortunate possession of a public domain that offered the opportunity to press the demand for room for the landless in the yet unsettled region of the west rather than in the crowded east. But it is not hard to see how this eastern appeal could be made to apply to the west, could spread to the western states and territories and would result in the petitions, which, with thousands of names attached, were submitted to the congress of the United States. But for congress successfully to be persuaded necessitated the aggressive activity of men in that body, as well as the exhortations of those outside. Within congress the cause of the homestead was taken up and steadily pressed by Andrew Johnson of Tennessee, to whose preparation for leadership in this regard some attention must now be given.

The years which Andrew Johnson had lived before his entrance into the house of representatives in 1843 had already gone to make up the strong but somewhat uncouth personality of the man.[49] Born in 1808 in Raleigh, North Carolina, at fourteen years of age he was ''bound out'' to learn the trade of a tailor; and a couple of years later together with an elder brother William he was advertised as a runaway from his master. After another two years he with his brother and stepfather had tramped across the mountains to the upper valley of the Tennessee, where in the long depression between the Alleghany mountains and the Cumberland plateau, which extends to the northeast far up into Virginia, lies the little town of Greenville. Among the treasures of the Drexel Institute in Philadelphia, the curious visitor may see two old account books much worn

[48] Hoagland treats of the industrial congress in *ibid.*, 1: 547-551. See also the masses of petitions in the House of representatives manuscripts, library of congress, which show the westward movement through Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin, and the influence of the land reformers and the industrial congress.

[49] An extended sketch of Andrew Johnson, from a not over-friendly point of view, is found in Oliver P. Temple, *Notable men of Tennessee, from 1833 to 1875, their times and their contemporaries* (New York, 1912).

and battered which were kept by Johnson in connection with his tailor shop. They show him lending small sums of money, and later performing small commissions on his trips to Washington. Unfortunately neither these nor any other sources have anything to say about the intellectual life of the young tailor. From later materials, however, one gathers that there was an early development of his oratorical ability, and that he was much given to reading, an art which had been painfully acquired. One hears nothing of feats of strength like those which gave a local celebrity to Lincoln, in whose early career there are indeed many elements of similarity. Nor, in Johnson's case does the seriousness of life seem to have been relieved by the humour which even though rude and rough, rescued Lincoln from the melancholy that sometimes overtook him. The earnestness with which Johnson felt obliged to defend himself against charges of infidelity permits one to suspect that he had perhaps been characterized by that skepticism of a cruder type which one meets in so many cases in the early part of the nineteenth century.[50] At a later time he showed that he had a considerable acquaintance with English literature and that if the range of his knowledge was limited, his mastery of what he had was thorough.

But his mental activity seems to have found its natural outlet in the field of politics. In this field one principle was undoubtedly a guiding force throughout his whole career. This was a bitter dislike of the superiority claimed by some men or for some men by virtue of greater possessions of wealth or more fortunate circumstances of birth. The vehemence with which he expressed these views surprises one, for one could hardly imagine the quiet town of Greenville or the whole valley of East Tennessee to be the theatre of a class struggle whether on the basis of birth or wealth. Here, with comparatively few slaves, there was none of the manorial life that, existing in much dignity and culture in both older and newer regions of the south, has so often and so mistakenly been regarded as universal. On the contrary, East Tennessee was a region of small farms in an upland valley. It was not a typical "poor white" region. One feels, therefore, that Johnson's hostility to aristocracy must represent resentment at

[50] See the printed pamphlet, *Letter of Andrew Johnson to his constituents* (Washington, 1845), to which reference is made below.

the treatment of social inferiority accorded to the poor artisan by the well-to-do farmers, and also an element peculiar to Johnson's own personality.

Within ten years from the time that Johnson reached Tennessee he had succeeded in politics to the extent of securing election, first to town offices in Greenville, and then as representative in the state legislature. In 1834 Tennessee adopted a new constitution. Before the convention came many questions of change, such as the demand for an abolition of slavery put forth by persons in East Tennessee. The sectionalism of the state was strongly marked, as it is to this day, finding a natural basis in the division of the state by the Cumberland plateau and the Tennessee river. When Johnson entered the lower house of the Tennessee assembly, it was at the first session after the adoption of the new constitution, when many statutes of semi-constitutional nature were debated so that there was an unusually good opportunity for a new representative to be educated in the practical working of the state government. It was the very time also of the revolt against the domination of state politics by the friends of General Jackson, out of which, so far as Tennessee was concerned, developed the whig party. After a period of hesitation Andrew Johnson threw himself whole-heartedly into the service of the regular democratic organization, a course which he tenaciously pursued to the time of the civil war.

Defeated for the next assembly, because, it is said, of opposition to internal improvements, Johnson was more successful in 1839. After another term in the house and one in the senate of the assembly, he was elected in 1843 representative in congress of the first Tennessee district. But before an attempt is made to follow him in his congressional career it will be best briefly to consider the work which he had done and the estimate which had been placed upon him when he entered national politics. Already he had exhibited political ability and force to an extent that warranted James K. Polk, chief master of the democratic organization in Tennessee, in suggesting Johnson as a possibility for the senate of the United States.[51] A bitter partisan, Johnson shared in the maneuver by which the democrats kept

[51] James K. Polk to Maclin, January 17, 1842. Polk papers, library of congress.

the state a couple of years without any United States senators rather than elect a whig. His radical tendencies had already manifested themselves in his support of the proposal to form East Tennessee into a separate state, a reflection of sectional jealousy. But the activity which later was most used abainst him was his support of the "white basis" for the arrangement of the congressional districts in Tennessee. This plan looked to the substitution in the arrangement of these districts of an apportionment according to the white population alone, in place of the existing "federal" basis, by which five negro slaves were to count as three white men. The effect of the change would be to give East Tennessee, with its fewer slaves, a larger share of the representatives in congress. It is interesting to examine Johnson's defense of this policy in answer to the charge of sympathy with the abolitionists which very naturally his enemies raised against him. He said that it was necessary to make the change for the very purpose of defending slavery. If the non-slaveholders of East Tennessee were satisfied within the state it would be the best means of preventing antislavery tendencies and making the state united. Against slaveholders as a superior class he frequently expressed himself in vigorous terms. But so far as I know his speeches and private letters reveal little or no sympathy with anything like abolition and his dislike of the abolitionists in general and of the New England sort in particular appears to have been thorough.

Such was Andrew Johnson when he entered congress in December, 1843, in the same session in which Stephen A. Douglas and Howell Cobb also began their congressional service. But whereas Douglas was at once placed at the head of a select committee to investigate a matter of apportionment, and thus brought into a conspicuous position, Johnson was given only a place in the committee on claims and in the committee on expenditures in the war department. In his first session he paid his tribute to party regularity in the debate on remitting the fine levied on General Jackson by Judge Hall of New Orleans and took part in the sectional struggle over the reception of abolition petitions which was now marked by the baiting of John Quincy Adams. Johnson accused the north of conspiring to break up the union through its attack on the south. "But when we of the

South,'' he said, ''who represent the interests of the slave states, contend for our rights Gentlemen say 'Oh you are too much excited, too much heated' . . .'' He denounced the famous statement of Adams in the last congress, that in case of a servile war the free states if called in to suppress insurrection in the south might establish emancipation.[52] At a later time a friendly editor said[53] that John Quincy Adams had declared Johnson to be possessed of more native ability than any man in the house of representatives. The literal exactness of this report may well be doubted; but in the memoir of Adams there is found an expression of appreciation for Johnson's support in a matter of parliamentary detail.[54]

While always in line with his party as against the whigs, Johnson nevertheless appears to have taken every possible opportunity to manifest his independence of the party leaders. Thus it happened that Stephen A. Douglas, Jefferson Davis, and Thomas H. Bagby of Virginia all felt the lash of Johnson's tongue. With these as with many of the whig leaders the occasion of ugly passages of debate was usually some sentiment or allusion which Johnson chose to consider as in some way reflecting upon the workingman. Again and again, sometimes it would seem with deliberate intent to pick a quarrel, or at least with a disposition to choose an unpleasant interpretation of a word, Johnson rose to declare himself the friend of the laborer. It is not hard to understand the bitterness with which such a man as Jefferson Davis, for instance, would remember such encounters,[55] nor to see that Johnson's manner must have interfered with his success in the larger fields of politics.

Quite as characteristic was the attitude of Johnson towards political matters. He supported all the measures of Polk's administration, but denounced the administration's plan to tax tea and coffee as oppressive of the poor. He conceived a bitter animosity to the new Smithsonian institution, and historical students will doubtless place him in their black books because he opposed

[52] *Congressional globe*, 28 congress, 1 session, 212-214.

[53] *Nashville Union*, May 10, 1853.

[54] *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, comprising portions of his diary from 1795 to 1848*, edited by Charles Francis Adams (Philadelphia, 1874-1877), 12: 240.

[55] Jefferson Davis, *Rise and fall of the confederate government* (New York, 1881), 2: 703; Varina B. H. Davis, *Jefferson Davis, ex-president of the Confederate States of America; a memoir by his wife* (New York, [1890]), 1: 242 ff.

appropriations for the relief of Mrs. Madison in the matter of the purchase of the Madison papers. He pressed with great energy his belief that there was an unfair distribution of the offices at the command of the executive,[56] urged that these should be divided in accordance with geographical regions and maintained that farmers and mechanics should be given a larger proportion. He proposed that the members of the supreme court should be put upon the elective basis, supported the familiar amendment which looked to changing the election of the president, and brought in one of the early amendments for the popular election of senators.[57]

Notwithstanding his radical principles, though one can hardly suppose it was because of them, Johnson served five terms in the house of representatives. Various competitors canvassed his district against him, of whom the most bitter in personal animosity was William G. Brownlow who poured upon Johnson all the poli-

[56] The exercise of the executive patronage and Johnson's discontent therewith formed the subject of an earnest conversation between Johnson and President Polk. *The diary of James K. Polk during his presidency, 1845 to 1849*, edited by Milo M. Quaife (Chicago, 1910), 2: 35-41.

[57] *Nashville Union*, May 21, 1849, citing "Gallery of portraits of past and present members of congress," No. 1, in *New York Sunday Times*, gave an extended sketch of Andrew Johnson, from which the following paragraph is taken:

"Owing to the want of early advantages, of which I have written above, Mr. J. at times slashes his mother-tongue, — pronouncing words of many syllables, or of recent foreign derivation, with little regard to rules laid down by Walker or Webster. More or less of his fellow-members will titter and sneer at Mr. J.'s many false anglicisms; yet I have rarely seen it done, save by someone smarting under the point of his oratorical bowie-knife. Though expressed in uncouth phraseology, his views are easily understood; for he talks strong thoughts and carefully culled facts in quick succession. He thrusts his opponents through and through, as with a rusty and jagged weapon, tearing a big wound and leaving something behind to fester and be remembered. Woe be unto the luckless wight who offers him a personal indignity — casts a slur upon him, in debate; for if he has to wait two years for the opportunity, when it *does* come, Mr. J. makes the best use of it. He puts no bridle upon his tongue; yet he is never guilty of a personal disrespect to a fellow-member, or even to the opposite party as a whole. Perhaps I may fairly characterize his efforts as being slashingly crushing, for he chops to mince-meat and then grinds to powder the men, measures and principles he may be contending against. He takes and maintains positions at times, which I can hear no *other* man advocate without feeling morally sure that the man is speaking without the least regard to the effect of his words upon his own prospects as a public man. He is emphatically the Ledru-Rollin of the House — that is, if Mr. Ledru-Rollin is an honest man. Mr. Johnson is, however, by no means afflicted with socialism. He would be the last man in the House to sanction the robbery of either class in society to pension any other class — not he."

tical vitriol of which he had so vast a supply and whom Johnson in return described as a "hyena." This domination of his district by Johnson was overthrown, not by any opponent, but by a gerrymander which the whigs arranged in 1852 with the deliberate intention of depriving Johnson of his seat. His answer to the challenge was to make the race for the governorship. Not only did he succeed but for the first time in a number of years a reelection followed. At the end of his second term he was able to bring to pass his election as senator; two years later he selected the other democratic senator, and in 1860 his name for several ballots was presented as that of a "favorite son" in nomination for the presidency by the Tennessee delegation in the Charleston convention. When one realizes that this political progress was maintained in spite of the opposition secret or open of many of the democratic leaders in the central and western parts of the state one sees all the more clearly the power that Johnson exerted over the mass of the voters in the state as a whole.

The congressional contest in which Brownlow sought to defeat Johnson was that of 1845. In answer to the attacks of Brownlow Johnson pursued the very customary course of issuing an address to his constituents. This was full of bitter controversial matter which, beyond one statement, is of no significance here. He attacked one of the community who, he said, "is violently opposed to me no doubt because I am too much the poor man's friend; because I, while a member of the Twenty-eighth Congress, was in favor of giving to every man, who could not raise a sum of money sufficient to pay the government price for the public land, a certain number of acres, (the numbers of acres though to be regulated in proportion to the number of children in family,) free of charge, by his moving to and settling upon it. While I have been standing by the poor man in getting him a home that he could call his, it will not be out of place, in this connexion, to ascertain what the opinions are of those who have been trying to crush me in the estimation of the people."[58]

The paternity of great public measures is often as much disputed as Homer's birthplace; and the parentage of the homestead bill has been claimed for many persons.[59] In a very schol-

[58] *Letter of Andrew Johnson to his constituents.*

[59] This has been due in part to a failure to distinguish carefully the homestead principle from that of the "log cabin" bill.

arly dissertation the latest writer upon this period in the history of the public lands, Mr. George M. Stephenson, has duly noted the resolution introduced January 4, 1844, in the course of the first session of the twenty-eighth congress, which was to instruct the committee on public lands to inquire into the expediency of passing a law to donate eighty acres of land to every actual settler "being the head of a family and living with the same and not now the owner of land and who through misfortune or otherwise is unable to purchase." This resolution was submitted by Robert Smith of Illinois. But Mr. Stephenson does not call attention to the fact that these lands were to be selected from those which had been ten years on the market, that is, lands of presumable inferior quality.[60] In the second session of this congress an amendment to the graduation bill, proposed by Thomasson of Kentucky, undertook to donate to every actual settler "being the head of a family" forty acres. It appears from the debate that this, too, had reference to lands that had previously been offered for sale.[61] In the first session of the twenty-ninth congress, however, independent homestead bills were introduced by Felix Grundy McConnell of Alabama and by Andrew Johnson of Tennessee.[62] It was at this session, as we have made clear above, that the graduation and reduction bill came so near passing; and both the bill of McConnell and that of Johnson,[63] together with the two earlier propositions

[60] Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands, from 1840 to 1862, from preemption to homestead*, 116; *Congressional globe*, 28 congress, 1 session, 103. In the following session, when the graduation bill was debated at length, Smith, on December 27, 1844, made a speech in reply to Causin of Maryland, who had upheld the eastern point of view. *Ibid.*, 28 congress, 2 session, 69 ff. In the first session of the next congress, on July 9, 1846, he made another extended speech on graduation, in which he referred to his resolution introduced in 1844. *Ibid.*, 29 congress, 1 session, 1062 ff.

[61] *Ibid.*, 28 congress, 2 session, 241. Cf. J. B. Sanborn, "Some political aspects of homestead legislation," in *American historical review*, 6: 27.

[62] McConnell asked permission to introduce his bill January 9, 1846. *Congressional globe*, 29 congress, 1 session, 172. Johnson asked another member to waive a motion which he wished to offer, to allow him (Johnson) to introduce his bill, but failed (March 9). *Ibid.*, 472. On March 12 he asked leave of the house to introduce the bill. *Ibid.*, 492. On March 27 he introduced the bill. *Ibid.*, 563. A copy of this bill (H. R. No. 319) was kept by Andrew Johnson and is still with a number of printed homestead bills in the Johnson papers, library of congress.

[63] On December 11, 1845, Ficklin of Illinois also submitted a bill to grant lands to actual settlers "under certain limitations." *Congressional globe*, 29 congress, 1 session, 43. The content of the bill does not appear.

mentioned, were closely connected with the parliamentary course of that measure and illustrated what we have called the western point of view. Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama pretty well represent that section of the country.[64] But among the petitions of 1844-1845 is one presented by Severance of Maine from Dudly P. Bailey and forty others of the same state requesting that congress "should pass with all convenient haste, a law by which every citizen, who may be desirous of cultivating the earth for a living, shall be enabled to enter upon the public lands and occupy a reasonable sized farm thereon free of cost."[65] A similar petition from Alleghany county, Pennsylvania, was presented January 30, 1846, by Darragh of that state[66] and a few days later Herrick of New York presented a memorial of the National Reform association with regard to the public land which was referred but not printed.[67] Herein are seen early manifestations of the radical eastern propaganda.[68]

McConnell, who seems to have been regarded by the house as something of a wit and to have been taken not very seriously, tried several times early in the session to introduce his bill which was to provide a home for "every man, maid or widow being the head of a family."[69] The last time he used the word "homestead:"[70] but this does not seem to have been in general use at this time. Andrew Johnson, many years later, claimed that his introduction of the bill antedated that of McConnell,[71] but it appears that McConnell really made the first efforts.[72] Both

[64] Thomasson, however, expressed a desire to remove the lands from the national treasury because he did not wish revenue from the public domain to break down the tariff.

[65] January 3, 1845. *Ibid.*, 28 congress, 2 session, 89.

[66] *Ibid.*, 29 congress, 1 session, 283.

[67] March 9, 1846. *Ibid.*, 471.

[68] The plans of Johnson and McConnell both fell short of the demands of the land reformers. *Documentary history of American industrial society* (Commons and associates ed.), 8: 64-65.

[69] *Congressional globe*, 29 congress, 1 session, 172 (January 9), 420 (February 24), 473 (March 9), 558 (March 26), 1045 (July 1).

[70] *Ibid.*, 1063 (July 6).

[71] *Ibid.*, 35 congress, 1 session, 3043.

[72] It was the advice to his students of a great teacher of history, Herbert B. Adams, to "avoid the use of the superlative." This applies, in general, to the efforts of historical writers to locate the "first" appearance of an idea; and, in particular, to the authorship or "fatherhood" of the homestead bill. Ten years before the period under consideration a Mississippi representative in congress, Franklin E.

Johnson and McConnell tried also to tack their measures on to the graduation bill, in the form of an amendment,[73] and McConnell made similar efforts in connection with other bills.

Within a few months McConnell committed suicide. Johnson continued in congress and therefore had the advantage of making repeated efforts to secure consideration for his bill.

The suggestions of giving grants of land to settlers which in the forms of petitions, resolutions, separate bills or amendments to the graduation and reduction bill had in 1844-1846 ushered in the beginnings of the homestead discussion were not followed up decisively in the congress of 1847-1849. The political maladjustment caused by the election of a whig house of representatives, the agitation over the Wilmot proviso, the bickering over the conduct of the Mexican war and the influence of the bounty law all acted unfavorably. But the agitation of the eastern radicals was having its effect. In the presidential campaign of 1848 the land reformers tried to enlist Martin Van Buren in their cause; but that wily politician and even the framers of the Buffalo platform were afraid to come out clearly for the full program of Evans and his followers. The Buffalo platform did include a homestead plank. Van Buren, however, declared himself not ready to assent to the free gift of the public lands. On the other hand Greeley gave his support to General Taylor and the regular whig ticket. Thus the adherents of land

Plummer, a native of Massachusetts, presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mississippi and made a speech thereon. The petition prayed for a law granting to each native citizen of the United States not already a landholder and who was not worth five hundred dollars, 160 acres of land on condition of settlement and continued cultivation for the period of five years. In his speech upon the petition Plummer said the condition of white men too poor to purchase a home was worse than that of the Indians. The petitioners were thankful for the preëmption laws, but asked for donations. They pointed out that the Mexican republic was holding out actual donations of land to settlers and that many would be compelled to seek in a distant land a home which they could not obtain here. Plummer condemned the United States government as the only nation on earth that ever adopted a policy of holding up its waste and unappropriated lands as a source of revenue except for some temporary reason. This may stand as the "first" congressional proposal of a real homestead measure, — until someone discovers an earlier one. *Register of debates in congress*, 1834-1835, 11: part 2, 1566-1570.

[73] *Congressional globe*, 29 congress, 1 session, 1077 (Johnson, July 10); 1192 (McConnell, August 4); 1200 (McConnell, August 6, on the Oregon bill). The bill of Johnson is reprinted in *Documentary history of American industrial society* (Commons and associates, ed.), 8: 62-64.

reform were divided.[74] Though in the east the homestead idea found friends in several political groups, no effective political organization made the measure exclusively its own. Thus in this period the history of the homestead bill had for the time a nonpartisan aspect different from that of the graduation bill in the campaign of four years before.

After the election the homestead principle again appeared in the house in two bills differing in content, the one submitted by Andrew Johnson, the other by Horace Greeley, a member of this congress. During this short session Johnson through illness was unable to look after his bill; and so he placed it in the care of his Tennessee colleague George W. Jones.[75] Jones accomplished nothing, and Greeley's bill was speedily tabled.[76] Greeley left congress, but Johnson had taken a fresh start and at every session during the remainder of his membership in the house of representatives he introduced a homestead bill in one form or another. In the thirty-first congress, that of the compromise of 1850, he had played a part of some importance in the election of Cobb as speaker, and for the first time was given the chairmanship of a committee,—that on public expenditures.[77] When he found the committee on public lands predisposed in favor of its own measure of graduating and reducing the price of the public lands, he tried the unusual expedient of reporting his bill from the committee on public expenditures,—his own committee. This naturally aroused instant protest. It was insisted that such a bill should go to the committee on public lands.[78] He

[74] See note 46 above, and Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands, from 1840 to 1862, from pre-emption to homestead*, 135-139. Theodore C. Smith, in his *The liberty and free soil parties in the northwest* (New York, 1897), discusses the election of 1848, but has little to say of the relation thereto of the question of the public lands.

[75] Johnson gave notice of his bill December 11, 1848. *Congressional globe*, 30 congress, 2 session, 25. Jones tried to introduce the bill February 14, 16, 1849. *Ibid.*, 534, 548.

[76] The bill was tabled by a viva voce vote February 27, 1849. *Ibid.*, 605. There was also a bill presented by E. Embree of Indiana, February 5, 1849. *Ibid.*, 454.

[77] *Ibid.*, 31 congress, 1 session, 88. Two years later he resigned this post, on the ground that he had nothing to do.

[78] He gave notice January 7, 1850. *Ibid.*, 131. On February 25 he reported the bill from his own committee. *Ibid.*, 408. Securing unanimous consent he introduced his bill February 27, and asked that it be referred to the committee on agriculture. This was refused and the bill was referred to the committee on public lands. *Ibid.*, 423, 424.

then tried a new tack. Finding more friendly some of the committee on agriculture, he changed the title of his bill so that it purported to be one to encourage agriculture. This committee got the bill before the house, and Johnson proceeded, on July 25, 1850, to make his first speech upon the bill.[79] He distinctly stated that this bill was a homestead bill, and remarked that when first introduced some five years ago it was considered wild and visionary. But now the public mind had been directed toward the measure and the most prominent men of the country were vying with each other in support of it. Senators "possessing the tallest intellect" had entered the competition. He wished it to be distinctly understood that he was "no agrarian, no leveller, as they were termed in modern times." He wished to elevate, not to pull down. In support of his proposition he cited Moses, Vattel, and Andrew Jackson, a somewhat curious combination of authorities. When he argued that the domain of United States belonged to the people as a whole, as much as the other great elements, air, fire, water, he was coming pretty close to the ideas of the land reformers.

Johnson's bill did not come to a vote.[80] But that a change was developing in the estimate which the public mind placed on this measure was manifested in the presentation in the senate of various propositions by Seward, Douglas, Webster and Sam Houston,[81] while Walker of Wisconsin suggested a combination of a homestead plan with one of cession to the states.[82] Seward's resolution looked to a grant of land to the exiles from Hungary; and it was over this phase of the question that most of the debate took place.

In the short session of 1850-1851 Johnson again introduced

[79] He gave notice of the new bill March 4, and June 4 it was introduced and referred. *Ibid.*, 448, 1122. The committee on agriculture reported the bill and Johnson spoke on July 25. His speech is given at length in *ibid.*, appendix, 2: 950-952.

[80] A bill proposed by Moore of Pennsylvania "to discourage speculation in the public lands" was also a homestead bill. *Ibid.*, 139, 424.

[81] For Douglas see *ibid.*, 75, 87 (December 24, 27, 1849). On December 24 (*ibid.*, 75) Cass had introduced a resolution looking to the severance of diplomatic relations with Austria. Seward's resolution to grant land from the public domain for the Hungarian exiles was offered January 9, 1850. *Ibid.*, 128. On January 22, Webster moved his resolutions which on March 28, on his own motion, were postponed. *Ibid.*, 616. Houston's proposal was made January 30. *Ibid.*, 262.

[82] December 24, 1849. *Ibid.*, 74.

his bill,[83] as did Walker in the senate. This time Johnson was supported by George W. Julian, who acknowledged[84] his debt to Johnson for the opportunity of making a speech. But future dangers in the way of the bill were made evident when Julian combined with his advocacy of the homestead bill an out and out abolition argument very unflattering to the south.[85]

The first session of the next congress, the thirty-second, immediately preceded the presidential canvass of 1852. A homestead bill finally passed in the house of representatives, notwithstanding the rivalry of a new form of distribution proposed by Bennett and very favorably received, and also an amendment skilfully urged by Cobb of Alabama, who professed friendship to the homestead principle. There was a long and interesting debate,[86] which revealed the importance which the bill had now attained. Early in April Johnson wrote to his friend Patterson "The 'Homestead' will pass without doubt unless some influence is brought to bear against is not now seen or known to exist. Various M.C. who were considered against it during the last Congress are now for it, viz. Toombs, Stephens, Venable, etc. The mongers in land warrants a[illegible]erating [*sic*] to some extent against it. I think in the end that can be turned to good account."[87]

In connection with the work of this session we have the most complete evidence of the relations that existed between Johnson and the land reformers of New York who, through the assistance of Greeley, were insistent in their pressure upon congress. Shortly after the bill had passed the house of representatives

[83] This session was marked by a considerable persistence on Johnson's part, and by evidences of opposition to the introduction of the bill on the part of those who controlled the house. *Ibid.*, 31 congress, 2 session, 22, 76, 94, 204, 216, 365, 752.

[84] George W. Julian, *Political recollections, 1840 to 1872* (Chicago, 1884), 103-104.

[85] January 29, 1851. *Congressional globe*, 31 congress, 2 session, appendix, 135.

[86] The bill passed the house May 12, 1852. *Ibid.*, 32 congress, 1 session, 1348 ff. The course of the debate on the bill may be traced by the indexes to the *Congressional globe* and appendix. Well chosen selections are printed in *Documentary history of American industrial society* (Commons and associates ed.), 8: 65-78. Among the members of this house who took up the cause of the homestead bill was Galusha A. Grow of Pennsylvania, then serving his first term. Grow was the youngest member of this congress. His biographers point out the fact that he became a disciple of Thomas Hart Benton, then a member of the house. James T. DuBois and Gertrude S. Mathews, *Galusha A. Grow, father of the homestead law* (Boston, 1917).

[87] Andrew Johnson to D. T. Patterson, April 4, 1852. Johnson papers, library of congress.

a mass meeting was arranged in New York, as to which Andrew Johnson, along with other prominent supporters of the measure in congress, was consulted. He wrote to Evans and the committee on invitation on May 24 in high approval of the meeting, but characteristically urged "I hope you will have your meeting gotten up as a 'Homestead' gathering, not connected with any of the isms of the day."[88] It developed, however, that he not merely wrote a sympathetic letter, but attended the meeting and made the principal speech. According to plan the audience gathered in the park on the afternoon of May 27, but was soon driven by a rainstorm to take refuge in the rotunda of the city hall. The crowd of hearers was described by the *Tribune* as large and enthusiastic; Greeley gave an extensive summary of Johnson's speech, and editorially praised it in terms that were warm and sincere.[89] Several weeks later Johnson wrote to a friend "I was in New York some time since. . . . I had quite a pleasant time of it in the Empire City, was treated there with marked kindness and attention."[90]

But the senate was deaf to outside appeals and refused to pass the bill.[91] Though he came from a western state, and though the west was now becoming nearly unanimous for the homestead, Felch, of Michigan, chairman of the senate committee on public lands, was unfriendly and found support in a special communication from John Wilson, the commissioner of the general land office. This included a criticism of the phraseology of the bill as submitted to him, and suggestions for improvement in this

[88] *New York Daily Tribune*, May 28, 1852. In the course of Andrew Johnson's canvas for reëlection to the governorship of Tennessee, in 1855, his affiliation with the "land reformers" was brought up against him by his political opponents as proof of his disorganizing and revolutionary doctrines. It was charged that his first message as governor had been copied from the "Address to the voters of the United States" put forth by the industrial congress of 1852, and his presence at the later sessions of the congress and his association with Gerrit Smith, Seward, Chase, Sumner and I. P. Walker of Wisconsin was used in the attempt to discredit him at home. *Republican Banner* and *Nashville Whig*, July 14, 1855. At the session of the industrial congress held in Albany, New York, at which I. P. Walker was nominated for the presidency, Johnson received three votes for that nomination on the first ballot, and his friend A. O. P. Nicholson, who had expressed very liberal views on the land question, received two votes. *New York Daily Tribune*, June 9, 1851.

[89] *New York Daily Tribune*, May 28, 1852.

[90] Andrew Johnson to S. Milligan, July 20, 1852, manuscript in Pennsylvania historical society.

[91] *Congressional globe*, 32 congress, 1 session, 1352, 1521, 2100, 2266.

respect, and also an opinion as to the merits of the measure as a whole, which was very unfavorable and brought up all the standard objections, — that the bill would involve a great loss of revenue, that this would involve a higher tariff or direct taxation, that the public lands were pledged by congress for the payment of the public debt, that the contracts with the states made upon their admission to the union would be impaired, that there was no discrimination as to the lands open to selection, so that mineral lands would be included, that no great national object was proposed, that the country would be deprived of this vast resource in the case of future wars, and that congress would draw on themselves an influence as irresistible as the force of gravitation.[92] These criticisms suggest other phases of the history of the public lands very closely interwoven with the political fortunes of the homestead bill, into the detailed consideration of which, in this paper, it has been impossible to enter.[93] The appropriation of vast quantities of land by the several bounty laws has been noticed; the extensive grants to railroads were already begun; California and the new territories presented their peculiar problems; it had been proposed to make gifts to hospitals for the indigent insane. Even more dangerous to the peaceful progress of the homestead bill was the sectional animosity threatened when Mason of Virginia identified the agitation for the homestead with the candidacy of John P. Hale for the presidency.[94] The increasing devotion to the measure of those who were attacking the institutions of the south was sure to turn southern support to southern hostility. Greeley claimed, however, that in the house more southern members voted for the bill than against it:[95] and in his New York speech Johnson

[92] John Wilson, acting commissioner, to A. Felch, June 18, 1852. House of representatives papers, library of congress.

[93] For the political history of these years see Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands, from 1840 to 1862, from pre-emption to homestead*, chs. 10, 11; and for a less dependable account, Dubois and Matthews, *Galusha A. Grow, father of the homestead law*, ch. 4. Cf. also John B. Sanborn, *Congressional grants of land in aid of railways* (Madison, 1899), and "Some political aspects of homestead legislation," in *American historical review*, 6: 19 ff.; L. H. Haney, *A congressional history of railways in the United States to 1850* (Madison, 1908), and *A congressional history of railways in the United States, 1850-1887* (Madison, 1910); Benjamin W. Palmer, *Swamp land drainage with special reference to Minnesota* (University of Minnesota *Bulletin* — Minneapolis, 1915); Orfield, *Federal land grants to the states with special reference to Minnesota.*

[94] *Congressional globe*, 32 congress, 1 session, 2267.

[95] *New York Daily Tribune*, May 28, 1852.

had eloquently pleaded the nonpartisan character of the measure.

The victory of Pierce, while favorable to the success of the graduation and reduction bill, was not encouraging for the homestead. In the short session that preceded the inauguration of Pierce the bill was again introduced in both houses, but again the result was failure.[96] At the close of this session, as has already been said, Andrew Johnson left the house of representatives to serve four years as governor of Tennessee and then to return as senator to the congress of the United States.

Coinciding in point of time with the beginning of the Pierce administration, the withdrawal of Johnson from the house defines a period in the history of the bill as well as in that of his own career. Reviewing what has been narrated we find that the homestead bill had its origin in a combination of forces. On the one hand it was an offshoot of the demand of the settler of the west for a further modification of the land system, and developed out of the proposal for graduating and reducing the price of the public lands. This policy of graduation was western, even southwestern, in its source, and politically was connected with the régime of Jacksonian democracy. But the homestead idea differed from the Bentonian scheme; and the difference consisted in the very elements which were embodied in the radical agrarianism of the eastern labor movement. With reference to the work of Evans Mr. Commons has written: "Not for the sake of those who moved west did Evans advocate freedom of the public lands, but for the sake of those who remained east. This was the idea that he added to the idea of Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson."[97] This identification of the attitude of Jackson and the attitude of Johnson seems to be mistaken. Johnson, who represented a southwestern state, was possessed of ideas very similar to those of the land reformers, if not derived therefrom, and it is just this fact that makes distinctive his contribution. Originally opposed even to the further reduc-

[96] The later phases of the bill to 1862 are discussed by Sanborn, *Congressional grants of land in aid of railways*; by DuBois and Mathews, *Galusha A. Grow, father of the homestead law* (with some exaggeration of the part played by Grow); and by Stephenson, *Political history of the public lands, from 1840 to 1862, from pre-emption to homestead*, chs. 12-15.

[97] *Documentary history of American industrial society* (Commons and associates ed.), 7: introduction, 31.

tion of the price of the public lands, opinion in the east was converted to the abandonment of the revenue policy for that of free grants. The earlier phases of the homestead movement brought to pass this change and the fusion of the eastern and the western points of view. In the accomplishment of this Andrew Johnson, of East Tennessee, played an important part. Not the inventor of the homestead idea, which can hardly be said to have been invented at all, and probably not the first to introduce the proposed legislation in congress, he was the first practical politician to make this policy particularly his own and persistently to force it upon the attention of congress.

In 1850 Johnson had written to his son-in-law: "I have strong hopes of getting the homestead bill through this winter. If I do I shall die happy."[98] He had now found reinforcement in the east, to whose artisan classes his personal appeal might one day be powerful. He could count certainly on some support from the south and southwest. The northwest was of all sections the one most certain to approve of the homestead bill. It must have been with some bitterness, therefore, that he left the house of representatives with his work yet uncompleted. But if it seemed hard to leave to others to reap the field where he had borne the burden and heat of the day, Johnson had at least brought it to pass that he himself was recognized as responsible for the success which thus far had been accomplished. On February 24, 1853, Senator Dodge of Iowa, replying to Senators Charlton and Dawson of Georgia who had opposed the homestead bill of this session, gave an historical retrospect concerning the bill in which he appealed particularly to the southern origin both of the principles of the bill and of the emigrants who profited by it. He quoted Macon of North Carolina, pointed out the support given by men of that type in North Carolina and Virginia to Benton's graduation bill which had passed the senate more than twenty-five years before with a provision for donating the refuse lands to actual cultivators. "After a seven years' struggle of the people's representatives in the other house" the homestead bill "thus assailed in advance in this body, passed. And I now have in my eye its indefatigable and

[98] Andrew Johnson to D. T. Patterson, December 23, 1850. Johnson papers, library of congress.

indomitable author, an esteemed friend and member of the House, (Hon. Andrew Johnson of Tennessee,) to whom, as one deeply sympathizing with him in sentiment, I return my thanks as an Iowa man. He is the type of the men for whom this bill is intended—now a most able and faithful member of Congress, once a mechanic struggling with poverty and working with the hands which God gave him, and expending that sweat by which it was the decree of the Almighty that man should obtain his bread.''[99]

As the career of Andrew Johnson peculiarly illustrates the opportunity which democracy in this country has offered, so the evolution of our land system, though accompanied by much that has been costly and wasteful, has yet been an evidence of the workings of self government. In the past the influence of the frontier, with its opportunity for the easy acquisition of lands, has been potent as a factor distinguishing American conditions from those in the old world. Now, the era of free land has about ended, and there is no longer the vast domain of unbroken prairie that was open for the operation of the homestead law. But it is hardly to be doubted that the land problem will remain, appearing in new phases, the solution of which will tax the best efforts of those who will devote themselves to the great reconstruction that must follow the present war; in which, as in the successful conclusion of military effort, the United States will, we know, play a part worthy of its vast power.

St. George L. Sioussat.

Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island

[99] *Congressional globe*, 32 congress, 2 session, appendix, 202.

THE PASSING OF THE FRONTIER[1]

The year 1848 marks the beginning of a new epoch in Illinois history. Not only had the polity of the commonwealth found it necessary to lay aside its swaddling clothes for a new constitution, but its citizens began to move forward in strides that rendered obsolete existing institutions and prevailing methods in almost every phase of the life of the times. Agriculture was revolutionized in many of its aspects; urban life discarded more and more of the traces of the frontier; the prairies were filled up by a progressive population which flowed in from every corner of the new and the old world; industry developed into new and untried fields; and the state came to take a front rank among Mississippi valley commonwealths. The way was prepared for the leading rôle Illinois was to play in bearing the burdens of the union in the storm and stress of civil war.

The outstanding feature of life in Illinois during the fifties was the passing of the frontier. Every aspect of its social and economic make-up declared that the spirit of western pioneering could not perpetuate its dominance over the growing commonwealth. Every rattle of a farm machine, every puff of a locomotive, was a blow at the peace and calm of the untamed prairie wilderness, still the haunt of the rabbit, the deer, and even the wolves — a taunt to the slow and inefficient man power of the primitive first settlers.

The upbuilding of towns and cities was one of the strongest indications of the rapid development of the state. Illinois of 1850 boasted only ten incorporated cities: Chicago, Alton, Springfield, Beardstown, Pekin, Quincy, Peoria, Bloomington, Galena, and Rock Island. Inasmuch, however, as several of these had been insignificant hamlets in 1840, this represented a remarkable development toward a more highly civilized commonwealth. There were in addition, moreover, towns of from three to five thousand inhabitants in places to which ten years before

[1] This article constitutes the first chapter of *The era of the civil war* by Arthur C. Cole, *Centennial history of Illinois,* volume III.

not so much as a trail had led.[2] It was noted that the growth of towns and villages seemed to run parallel with the growth of grain; cities grew up only at points of special vantage for the penetration of interior districts by incoming settlers and for the ready exchange of farm products for the finished output of the factory and workshop. For this reason the river towns of the forties had swelled into thriving cities, their life supplied by the sonorous breathing of steam engines; and a business formerly confined to the barter of hazelnuts, butter, and eggs, for buttons, beads, cap ribbons, powder, and shot, was replaced by a business of thousands of dollars in merchandise and produce.[3] For this reason, too, the network of railroads that came to traverse the state developed the municipalities in the fifties; Chicago increased from a city of 29,963 in 1850, to 80,028 in 1855, and 109,260 in 1860.

Rapid accumulation of population prevented the municipal improvements that might well have been expected of places of such size, for in most senses the cities and towns were mere overgrown villages. Housing facilities could not keep pace with such rapid growth; dwellings were small and crude, often mere shacks. Bloomington erected over 250 new dwellings in 1850, and a scarcity was still noted, while newcomers to Springfield, after looking in vain for some place of residence, passed on in hopes of finding a more favorable location.[4] Home-owning was fairly general among the older townspeople; but rents for the newcomers were uniformly high, sometimes exorbitant. There was a steady shortage of dwellings in Alton, and houses were "worth from fifteen to twenty per cent. per annum on their cost."[5] In Chicago houses that cost $500 sometimes rented for $300 and $400 a year; "a moderate little tenement which might be got in the suburbs of London for £25 per annum here fetches £200," reported a visiting Britisher.[6]

[2] *Chicago Daily Journal* clipped in *Illinois State Register*, June 22, 1850.

[3] *Naples Observer* clipped in *Belleville Advocate*, September 12, 1850.

[4] *Illinois Journal*, May 18, 20, 23, 1850.

[5] *Alton Courier*, February 7, 1854, see also September 27, 1852, March 9, 1853, March 20, 1854.

[6] *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, April 7, 1855. Special correspondence of *London Times* clipped in *Chicago Tribune*, November 12, 1860; see also *Chicago Press and Tribune*, April 2, 1859. Missionary effort in the west was discouraged by rents of $200 or $300 for houses that would bring only $60 in the east. *Presbytery Reporter*, 4: 74.

Alongside these conditions, however, were others which showed how hard it was for Illinois to outgrow entirely the frontier atmosphere that had shortly before prevailed in most parts of the state. The backwoods pioneer was not wholly out of his element in the cities, still less in the towns and villages. Even the editor of the *Charlestown Courier* protested at the "enormous rent" he had to pay for his newspaper plant, $60 a year. At the same time the sturdy shoemaker at Morris had high hopes of establishing his economic prosperity on a capital of $50; he proposed to build a "small house 12 by 12 middling lumber, nails, doors, windows, $12.00 put up by a few neighbors gratis. $25.00 for stock in my line of business which is shoemaking and the Ballance as a reserve and i am certain of doing well." Both men applied to the governor of the state for the necessary loans, the one as a political backer, the other as a stranger whose only security was "the word of a man of honor," and who submitted as a text Raleigh's lines, "True nobleness is not confined to palaces alone."[7] It is to be hoped that Governor French was able to justify their confidence — the sublime confidence of the pioneer in the spirit of democratic coöperation.

No town or city was sufficiently urban to develop a drainage system. In bad weather the streets approached the condition of a quagmire with dangerous sink holes where the boatman's phrase "no bottom" furnished the only description. An absence of civic pride made them the dumping ground of the community rubbish so that the gutters were filled with manure, discarded clothing, and all kinds of trash, threatening the public health with their noxious effluvia.[8]

In Chicago the drains in the streets, the alleys, and the vacant lots were "reeking with every description of filth;" "all the slops of the houses, and the filth of every kind whatsoever, incident to cities, are emptied in the gutters, and offend the nostrils of every traveler, either on the sidewalks or the streets," complained a zealous advocate of clean streets. Michigan avenue was decorated with manure heaps while the contents of stables and pigsties were deposited upon the lake shore, a horri-

[7] J. J. Brown to French, April 3, 1849; James Campbell to French, July, 1851, French manuscripts.

[8] The square at Springfield always seemed in a disgusting condition. *Illinois State Register,* March 17, 24, 1853; *Illinois Journal,* September 13, 1853.

ble stench arising from that "Gehenna of abominations." The rain washed this filth into the lake to be mixed with the drinking water supply of the city, for nothing short of frogs or fish seemed to clog the supply pipes of the city water system. The zealous apostle of cleanliness was often served with "chowder" in his bathtub. Some improvement was made in the later years of the decade; paving with planks, macadam, or cobblestones reduced the problems, although only a few dozen miles were paved out of the four hundred miles of city streets.[9]

Then, too, every city had its hog nuisance or some equivalent. The streets, squares, and parks seemed public hogpens; hog holes with all their filth met the eye and nose at every turn. Springfield wrestled with this problem long and earnestly; the controversy came to a climax in 1853, when an ordinance allowing the hogs to run at large was successively passed and repealed, followed by the requirement that they be rung if allowed to run at large. The city council was equally divided over this question and the mayor pursued a vacillating course in casting the deciding vote; while the hog and anti-hogite forces wrangled, his swineship contentedly pulled himself out of the mushy batter of his gutter-wallow, threatening to upset pedestrians as he carefully chose a freshly painted fence against which to plant himself and transfer the unctious matter with which he was loaded. In the fall of that year swine were more numerous on the streets of Springfield than in the pens of the state fairgrounds. Urbana had a record of more hogs in the community than people, and the porker had equal rights with citizens upon the streets. Decatur's anti-hogite forces triumphed by a narrow margin in 1859. For a time cows ran at large on the streets of Chicago, often passing the night on the sidewalks. Quincy prided itself on the use of geese instead of hogs as street scavengers.[10]

At the beginning of the decade not one of the cities of the state was provided with public utilities. Chicago almost immediately, however, arranged to have its streets lighted by gas

[9] *Chicago Democrat*, March 30, May 7, 1849, August 7, 1851; *Free West*, June 22, 1854; *Chicago Press and Tribune*, October 8, 1858, March 25, April 2, 1859.

[10] *Illinois State Register*, May 5, 12, June 30, 1853; *Illinois Journal*, May 12, September 7, November 9, 1853; *Urbana Union*, September 27, 1855; *Chicago Democrat*, September 19, 1849; *Quincy Whig*, August 15, 1853; June 26, 1854.

and shortly afterwards provided itself with a sewerage system and a water system, though the latter was far from carrying out the original plan to supply the city with pure and wholesome water. Pekin and Rockton prepared to install water systems in 1853, while Quincy and Peoria put their energies into gas companies. Not until two years later were Springfield and Quincy able to arrange for water systems; by that time gas, light, and coke companies were organized in all the more progressive cities.[11]

Chicago, the "garden city," became in this period a cosmopolitan metropolis, the commercial emporium of the Lake Michigan region and the adjacent states. The foreign born population came to outnumber the native born, with a considerable representation for every national group. After the completion of the Illinois and Michigan canal the current of trade which formerly flowed down the Mississippi was turned eastward, making Chicago the great market place of the west to the disadvantage of St. Louis, which had previously dominated the situation. Excellent and extensive railroad connections next brought additional advantages; in 1854 seventy-four trains a day tapped the upper Mississippi and the whole northwest. By 1851 the total value of the trade of the lake port reached nearly $30,000,000; in 1855 it had a grain trade of 20,487,953 bushels, nearly twice that of its rival on the Mississippi. It had already become the greatest primary wheat depot in the world; in spite of a chronic complaint of a shortage of capital, by 1860 over five million dollars of capital were invested in Chicago.[12]

This precocious western city presented many incongruities. In 1850 it had several impressive public edifices, "large warehouses and stores, five or six stories high, splendid hotels, five public schools and dwellings, frequently magnificent churches;"[13] ten years later it had taken on an even more metropolitan atmosphere. Yet at the same time these massive stone and brick stores, warehouses, and factories, even "palatial" hotels, were

[11] *Quincy Whig*, August 15, 1853, June 26, 1854; *Private laws of 1853*, 417-422, 504-505, 510-511, 516-517; *Private laws of 1855*, 544 ff.

[12] *DeBow's Review*, 15: 374; *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, January 7, 1856; *Illinois State Register*, December 21, 1854.

[13] *DeBow's Review*, 15: 374. It was called "the city of churches;" it laid claim to having more free public schools than any city of its size in the world. *Chicago Democrat*, May 4, June 5, 1849.

surrounded by wooden huts and shanties. Rough stumps of pine trees were set along the roads in all directions to carry telegraphic wires. On the occasion of the visit of the Prince of Wales in 1860, the *London Times* correspondent reported that Chicago was an "extraordinary *mélange* of the Broadway of New York and little shanties of Parisian buildings mixed up in some way with backwoods life."[14] The streets, though filthy, were generally broad and pleasant; and a commendable zeal for planting rows of shade trees furnished the beginnings of city beautification. An extensive park system was planned and given authorization by the state legislature. Regular omnibus service was started on the principal thoroughfares in 1850, while the State street horse railroad was opened in April, 1859. The community supported seven daily papers in 1853, besides weeklies and monthlies. With the westward march of the American people, Chicago came to have a central location; equipped with fifty-seven hotels in 1855, eight of which were "first class," it had come to be a point of attraction as a convention city.[15]

Springfield, the state capital, a city of 4,533 in 1850 and of 9,320 in 1860, was a place of few attractions. It had little civic beauty, was famous for the wretched condition of its streets, and for a long time lacked a single good hotel. Citizens talked of a waterworks system during the entire decade without accomplishing anything; nor did it acquire any other public utilities. It was amazingly slow in starting a system of public schools. Yet it had all the optimism of the day; lots on the public square sold as high as $100 a foot, and farming property on the outskirts was worth up to $100 an acre; its citizens always vigorously opposed the numerous proposals from rival cities to move the state capital to a more suitable point.[16]

Alton, an important port on the Mississippi, struck out aggressively for a railroad connection with Chicago and for a cross-state line to Terre Haute; these brought so important a westbound traffic to the city that, with the rush of settlement to Kansas, a direct steamship line to that territory was established

[14] *Chicago Tribune,* November 12, 1860.

[15] *Chicago Press and Tribune,* March 5, April 2, 1859; *Chicago Democrat,* April 21, 1855.

[16] *Illinois State Journal,* February 28, 1861; *Illinois State Register,* August 25, September 1, 8, 1853. The only change they ever would concede was that in the name "Sangamo" or "Illini" as more suitable than Springfield for the state capital.

which, as the easiest route, gave the city many of the economic advantages that St. Louis had previously secured from this movement. Peoria was a beautiful young city in 1860 with an important commerce sustained by a tributary agricultural region of unsurpassed fertility and first-rate facilities for manufacturing.[17] In the decade it had passed Galena, to become, with a population of 14,045, the second largest city in the state.

Cairo was in this period Illinois' great city of prophecy, the speculation of a company of eastern capitalists. Situated at "the most important confluence of rivers in the world" and at the center of the American republic, at the southern terminus of the Illinois Central, it was expected — as the *entrepôt* between the northern and southern markets — to dominate commercially the Ohio, Wabash, Tennessee, and Cumberland valleys as well as the great northwest, becoming, as a great inland emporium, the largest city in the world. In 1850, however, it was an embryo city of 242 inhabitants, living largely in wharf boats and small temporary shanties, waiting for the marshy bottom lands to be reclaimed from the overflow of the rivers.[18] With the beginning of active work on the Illinois Central, rapid developments took place, so that by 1860 the city had an enthusiastic population of 2,188, with the neighboring towns of Mound City and Emporium competing for a share of the expected prosperity.

Some of the more important centers of that period were places which after a few decades ceased to find favor with Dame Fortune. In 1860 Quincy was a bustling river port of 13,718 which prided itself on its gas plant and other civic improvements. Belleville, "a firm city of brick," with half a dozen breweries, was a prosperous community of 7,520, famous throughout the west for its lager beer. It sold great quantities of dry goods, hardware, and groceries to the Illinois back country; its place with reference to St. Louis corresponded to that of East St. Louis of today, then the insignificant village of Illinoistown.[19] Beardstown, thriving on the transportation facilities furnished by the Illinois and Michigan canal, was an im-

[17] *Presbytery Reporter*, 3: 247; *Western Journal*, 1: 113-114, 2: 267 ff.; *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, July 12, 1855.

[18] *DeBow's Review*, 19: 683; *Illinois Organ*, April 26, 1851; *Chicago Daily Journal*, June 10, 1851.

[19] *Belleville Advocate*, February 22, 1849, March 2, May 4, 1859.

portant market for grain and provisions, but won its right to public attention chiefly through the busy scenes at its hogpens and slaughterhouses. Peru was for a time the successful competitor of its nearest neighbor, La Salle, for the benefits of the termination of the canal. Separated by only a half-mile, connected by river steamers with St. Louis and by the Illinois Central with Chicago and Galena, and crossed by the Rock Island and Chicago route, the two places promised to furnish the location for an important trade emporium. The spokesman of the sister town of Ottawa was compelled to admit that there was "more enterprise in a half dozen men in Peru than in the whole of Ottawa put together." The latter, however, soon began a rapid development so that real estate boomed and farms two or three miles out sold for from fifty to one hundred and fifty dollars an acre.[20]

These cities and towns were the focusing points of a population of 851,470 that had by 1850 found homes in the midwest commonwealth. The state had already given proof of having attained its majority by showing a natural increase of a native born poplation of 333,753. This generation which had played no direct part in the westward march of the pioneer bade fair to outgrow the ideas and ideals of their sires. Already names of native Illinoisians began to appear on the roll of the houses of the general assembly,[21] although as candidates for important offices they were still rare.

Another decade during which the population of the state increased to 1,711,951 was to work important consequences in obliterating the more important frontier survivals. So rapid, indeed, did the forces of progress move in Illinois that the growing sophistication drove out the restless pioneering spirits to the frontier regions of the far west. In the period after 1848 they contributed largely to the development of California, Kansas and Nebraska, and Colorado. With the discovery of gold in California the "gold fever" attacked the Illinoisians; "Ho, for California!" became the rallying cry everywhere. In the winter of 1848-1849 companies began to form at various

[20] *Ottawa Free Trader*, November 30, 1850, May 13, 1854; *Beardstown Gazette*, April 30, 1851.

[21] *Alton Courier*, March 11, 1865.

points ready to move west in the spring.[22] These companies, organized under strict regulations which excluded all but persons of industry and good reputation, usually elected a captain, lieutenants, sergeants, and wagon master, and hired a guide to conduct them on the Overland trail. Stout wagons were procured, drawn by horses, a double team of mules, or three or four yoke of oxen. At first the young men were the victims of the California fever, then the infection spread to the older generation—for the romance of the gold fields made a wide appeal. In certain districts about Quincy, by February, 1849, a majority of the males were making preparations to leave. Prosperous farmers and settled artisans joined the restless youths; 10,000 to 15,000 were scheduled to leave that year. Illinois seemed the banner state in its contribution of "forty-niners;" a majority of the wagons on the Overland seemed to hail from Illinois. Plans for a company of fifty or sixty were made in Alton in January; by March one hundred and twenty selected emigrants took the trail as the "Sucker Mining Company." Companies from Springfield, Jacksonville, and other points in western Illinois were soon off in parties of fifty, one hundred, or more. Many small groups left without flourish or display; on the trail they seemed to outnumber the organized companies. "Every wagon is apparently an independent nation of itself—every emigrant a captain," reported an enthusiastic emigrant.[23]

The progress of the emigrants on the trail was reported by the newspapers and aroused new interest. Finally, in 1850, however, as a result of editorial warnings, of discouraging letters from unsuccessful adventurers, and of the complaints of "California widows," a dismal picture of life in California replaced the glittering mirage; and contentment with prevailing conditions was restored in Illinois. The beginning of 1852 saw a serious recurrence of the California fever, but after another season of heavy migration the movement to California was gradually restored to a normal basis.[24]

[22] *Illinois Journal*, December 20, 1848; *Quincy Whig*, December 26, 1848; *Beardstown Gazette*, December 27, 1848; *Illinois Globe*, January 6, 1849; *Chicago Democrat*, January 9, 1849.

[23] *Quincy Whig*, February 6, 1849; *Illinois State Register*, May 31, 1849; *Alton Telegraph*, March 23, 1849.

[24] *Illinois Journal*, October 17, 1849, February 8, 1850; *Illinois Globe*, December 22, 1849; *Ottawa Free Trader*, March 16, 1850, January 31, 1852; *Alton Telegraph*,

No sooner had the gold fever subsided, however, than another diversion came, when the fertile fields of Kansas and Nebraska were thrown open to settlement in the spring of 1854. An important movement had already begun the previous year; but now old rangers prepared in companies to go west to establish land claims in the new territory.[25] The genuine hard-fisted yeomanry of the older portions of southern and eastern Illinois yielded to the temptingly high prices offered for their own farms and transferred their families to the new pioneer field. The attention of the land speculator was also attracted to the new opportunities for investment.

A different incentive, however, soon came to dominate this emigration; in the fight between the north and the south for the control of the new territory under squatter sovereignty the people of Illinois began to take a hand to preserve Kansas from the institution of slavery. An advance guard of one hundred and fifty New Englanders sent out by the Emigrant aid society had passed through Illinois en route for Kansas in July and aroused considerable attention;[26] when other companies followed, alongside the pioneer who sought the more fertile prairies of the west and alongside the restless adventurer there marched from the sober homes of the northern counties, from the rich military tract, the garden of Illinois, the sturdy pilgrim who proposed to plant and water the seeds of freedom in that fresh soil.

In the beginning no special encouragement to emigrants was necessary; emigrant wagons passed through the state with the letters "Kansas" and "Nebraska" boldly chalked on their canvas coverings. The first mission from Illinois went from Quincy; a "Nebraska colonization company" was organized in that neighborhood in March, 1855, to found a city named Fontenelle, in which the moral and intellectual atmosphere of a free community should be preserved in a literary society and other insti-

March 22, 1850; *Beardstown Gazette*, February 11, 1852; *Quincy Whig*, March 16, April 26, 1852. The *La Salle Standard* reported the passage of at least a hundred wagons a day with three to five persons each. Five to twenty-five persons passed through Peru daily.

[25] *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, November 26, 1853; *Urbana Union*, March 23, 1854; *Illinois Journal*, April 13, 1854; *St. Clair Tribune*, April 22, May 13, June 3, 1854; *Belleville Advocate*, June 14, 1854.

[26] *Alton Weekly Courier*, July 27, 1854.

tutions. But when blood began to flow upon the soil of Kansas, the more timid held back. Then companies of young free-state men were organized and conducted to the field of "bleeding Kansas," prepared, with Sharpe's rifles in their hands and the plow and sickle among the baggage, for either peace or war.[27] Following them whole communities were aroused to take part in these ventures; the material means to transfer these companies to Kansas were collected in the spring of 1856 by emigrant aid or Kansas settlers' societies in Chicago, Rockford, and other towns.

Excitement began to quicken when, in spite of their military preparations, the Chicago company was held up by a superior force of Missourians, disarmed, and sent back to Alton under guard; while the outrage fanned the zeal for aiding Kansas sufferers, the company was again fitted out and sent to Kansas by a safer route.[28]

A state Kansas aid committee was created in Illinois to dispense relief, and local committees were organized and set to work. Upon the arrival of the news of the destruction of Lawrence, the free-state stronghold in Kansas, a meeting was held at Rockford at which $1,000 was easily raised as the nucleus of a fund to represent that community. At the same time a Chicago meeting raised $15,000 to aid persons willing to go to Kansas as actual settlers. Not to be outdone, the ladies of Chicago organized a "Kansas women's aid and liberty association," with active auxiliaries in the important towns and villages of northern Illinois, and sewing societies worked for the relief of their distressed sisters in Kansas.[29]

Enthusiasm thus aroused caused a general revival of unassisted emigration in the spring of 1857.[30] Thus did a state which a few years before had been the El Dorado of agricultural pioneers, give up a part of her settlers and their descendants to fill up the still farther "great west."

[27] *Rockford Register*, February 23, March 8, 1856; *Rockford Republican*, March 5, 1856; *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, March 31, December 22, 1855.

[28] *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, July 12, 19, 1856; affidavit of Charles H. Wood, August 1, 1856, Trumbull manuscripts.

[29] *Rockford Republican*, May 28, 1856; Peter Page to Trumbull, June 3, 1856, Trumbull manuscripts; *Chicago Weekly Democrat*, June 21, 28, 1856.

[30] *Rockford Republican*, February 26, 1857; *Aurora Beacon*, March 9, 1857; *Illinois State Journal*, April 1, 1857; *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, June 5, 1857.

In the closing years of this decade, the rumor of the discovery of gold again reached Illinois, and the lure of the gold fields aroused the spirit of adventure in the manhood of Illinois. Soon the old scenes of 1849 were renewed; a rush to Pike's Peak attracted companies of young men from all sections of the state, usually in smaller groups than in the California gold rush. Thousands left for the gold fields and many others had completed preparations before the news came in May that the gold hunters were returning in droves with the cry of "humbug."[31]

The place of these citizens lost by Illinois to the trans-Mississippi west had been more than filled by a great influx from without which was still bringing in a great diverstiy of population. There was the Yankee stock from the rugged farms of New England, enterprising fortune seekers from the seaboard states as a whole, and, coming from the old world at the same time, the restless, ambitious, and freedom-loving refugees from the political and economic oppression of the European states — all destined to do their part in the development of the hospitable prairie commonwealth and by the diversity of the cultures they introduced to hasten the passing of the frontier.

Of the American born immigrants it was in a large measure the northern elements that made up the westward movement. The Yankee immigrants found a special welcome because of their "good old New England character for thrift, morality, and intelligence;" furthermore they usually brought enough means to purchase improved farms, thus freeing the true pioneer to exploit other pieces of the prairie wilderness.[32] The Yankees showed a strong tendency to migrate in parties or even in well-organized colonies, groups of from twenty to forty families being fairly common. In 1855 two hundred families came from the vicinity of Rutland, Vermont, under the auspices of the Vermont emigrant association, and, on the lands opened up by the Illinois Central, established a new Rutland in La Salle county. New England groups first sought their kind and kin

[31] *Quincy Whig*, January 28, March 19, 1859; *Ottawa Free Trader*, April 2, 1859; *Chicago Press and Tribune*, March 28, 1859; *Rockford Register*, May 14, 1859; *Ottawa Weekly Republican*, May 14, 1859; *Alton Courier*, May 19, 1859.

[32] *Illinois Journal*, May 19, 1853; *Carthage Republican* clipped in *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, November 24, 1855; *Belleville Advocate*, November 26, 1856; *Cairo City Gazette*, April 29, 1859; *Rock River Democrat*, April 28, 1857; *Alton Courier*, February 4, 1854.

in the northern counties, but it was not long before they turned to the attractive fields of middle and southern Illinois. In those regions the colony grouping was even more marked. Near the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi with the Illinois Central was Hoyleton, a Yankee colony of Congregational temperance men and republicans; in their zeal for education they included in their plans the scheme of erecting a seminary of learning.[33] In Egypt, Yankee industry and frugality were welcomed, for they promised to bring about the development of the wealth that lay latent and unused in southern Illinois. Many a local poet paid tribute to this vast transforming force:

> "And westward ho! on either side,
> See towns as if by magic rise;
> What Genii then the wonder works?
> Why, none—but Yankee enterprise."[34]

Both the Egyptian and the New England pilgrim, however, realized the absence of congeniality in their interests; the one frankly voiced his execration of "Yankee 'kinks' in politics," while the other deplored the survival of "intemperance accompanied with ignorance and indolence" that dated from the earlier settlers from the south.[35] "One thing is certain," declared a new arrival, "that where New England emigrants do not venture, improvements, social, agricultural, mechanic, or scientific, rarely flourish, and seldom intrude."

[33] *Ottawa Free Trader*, May 2, 1857; *Rockford Republican*, May 7, 1857; *St. Clair Tribune*, May 22, 1857; *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, July 18, 1855; *Cairo City Times*, July 25, 1855; Ovid Miner to Trumbull, May 31, 1860, Trumbull manuscripts; *Central Illinois Gazette*, June 8, 1859.

[34] *Belleville Advocate*, February 8, 1849. The Yankee bard paid his respects to the attractions of Illinois in the *Boston Post*:

> "Westward the * of Empire takes its Course."
> Come, leave the fields of childhood,
> Worn out by long employ,
> And travel west and settle
> In the state of Illinois:—
> Your family is growing up,
> Your boys you must employ.
> Come, till the rich prairies
> In the state of Illinois.

Clipped in *Belleville Advocate*, April 25, 1850.

[35] *Cairo City Times*, July 25, 1855; unsigned letter to Trumbull, January 11, 1858, Trumbull manuscripts; see also *Western Citizen*, August 3, 1852.

New Yorkers, Pennsylvanians, Ohioans, and even Hoosiers also came to play an important part in the settlement of central and southern Illinois. First, the Wabash valley, claimed by boosters to be the garden of America, was the region of attraction; wagons crossed the river at Terre Haute almost as fast as the ferry boats could carry them. With the opening up of railroad connections, however, settlers spread over the entire lower half of the state, which the best class of immigrants previously passed by. Two hundred Pennsylvanians came in a group to settle in Adams county near Mendon. Joseph and M. L. Sullivant, wealthy land owners of Columbus, Ohio, purchased many thousand acres of Illinois prairie and sent out several well-equipped parties of industrious farmers and mechanics to develop them; ex-Governor William Bebb of Ohio bought an extensive tract in Winnebago county.[36] These and similar ventures testified to a new era in Illinois settlement, when the advanced stages of the frontier had been pushed well across the Mississippi.

A novel feature of the immigration movement was the assisted migration of women and children. Missionary societies in cities like Springfield and Danville sent agents to the east to select worthy orphans to place in Illinois homes; groups of twenty-five to fifty were brought west and distributed among the farmers, to whom they were indentured until they became of age. It is evident that the problem of labor supply entered into this charity, and such an element is even more apparent in the scheme to secure for the west the surplus female population of eastern cities. In 1858 the agents of women's protective immigration societies in New York and Philadelphia placed groups of fifty as servants in each of the towns of Decatur, Springfield, and Urbana.[37]

Only a slight immigration entered Illinois from the southern states. North Carolina made some contributions, while Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky sent many settlers across the

[36] *Illinois Organ*, June 28, 1851; *Terre Haute Journal* clipped in *Illinois State Register*, October 11, 1849; *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, March 6, 1855, April 18, 1857; *Belleville Advocate*, July 18, 1855.

[37] *Illinois Journal*, August 4, 1855; *Illinois State Journal*, January 13, March 17, 24, 1858; *Urbana Union*, February 21, 1856, March 18, 1858; *Aurora Beacon*, April 20, 1857; *Belleville Democrat*, April 17, 1858; *Belleville Advocate*, November 20, 1857; *Our Constitution*, March 13, April 3, 1858.

Ohio; but they were outnumbered even in Egypt by northern-born settlers. These new southern immigrants were superior to the old stock; they seemed "a better class, accustomed to think & act for themselves."[38]

The distracted state of affairs in Europe, with economic oppression increasingly unbearable and with liberal and revolutionary forces crushed under the iron heel of reactionary authority, promoted a spirit of restlessness that made the thoughtful, sober-minded workers

> "Turn from the old world their anxious eyes,
> To seek a home beneath the western skies."[39]

Crowded cities of the old world poured forth a mighty stream of immigrants, whom Illinois received with enthusiastic welcome. With almost every national element already represented in the population of the state, Illinois offered the bewildered immigrant a hospitable asylum among friendly fellow-countrymen. The hardy workmen found places in the vast system of public works just being undertaken; to the more prosperous newcomers were offered the fertile farms of the state.[40]

Of the European nations, Germany and Ireland made the largest contributions to Illinois; in 1860 there were in the state 130,804 Germans and 87,573 Irish. Illinois drew so large a quota of the immigrants from all countries that even before 1850 it could boast of 111,860 foreign born settlers, or one-eighth of the total population of the state; by 1860 their number had nearly tripled, reaching a total of 324,643. Chicago, rapidly becoming an important immigration depot, retained so large a number of the new arrivals that the foreign-born population of the city actually outnumbered the natives.

For a considerable period Illinoisians seem to have been unaware of the size of this foreign element. In January, 1854, however, the ice in the Mississippi held up fourteen steamers loaded with two thousand German and Irish immigrants, who landed near Cairo and, suffering greatly from cold, want of food, fever, and cholera, drew attention to the fact of the heavy foreign immigration. It became evident that the German and

[38] Edward Holden to Trumbull, March 9, 1858, Trumbull manuscripts.

[39] *Chicago Daily Journal* clipped in *Illinois State Register*, July 5, 1849.

[40] *Belleville Advocate*, May 1, 1851.

Irish emigrant societies of St. Louis who aided in the relief work had no effective Illinois counterpart, although a few local German societies had their agents on the ground. It became widely published, also, that of the emigrants landing at New York in 1856 seven per cent went to Illinois, but they brought with them over fourteen per cent of the "cash means" listed with the immigration authorities. Inducements to foreign immigrants to come to Illinois were therefore urged; a proper immigration system at Chicago was especially favored.[41]

A considerable accession of French and French Canadian settlers was made during the fifties. The sons and daughters of *La belle France* increased so rapidly in Chicago that just when the influence of the old régime had about disappeared they became numerous enough to erect a church of their own where services were performed in their own language. French confectionery establishments began to make their appearance and even a French hotel. Nearby was the strong French Canadian settlement at Kankakee. It had steadily grown with fresh additions from lower Canada, the emigration becoming so considerable that the Canadian government took alarm. In 1857 a French paper, the *Journal de L'Illinois*, started publication at Kankakee with a subscription list of 1,200 persons. Twelve miles up the Kankakee river, at St. Anne, a new settlement of French families from Montreal and Quebec was started in 1852 by Father Chiniquy, a Roman Catholic priest and temperance apostle of note, who acted as a spokesman of French Canadian discontent; by 1860 these two settlements included over 1,500 families. The settlement at St. Anne was then just recovering from a period of hard times and financial embarrassment. Father Chiniquy, moreover, had become involved in a long and bitter contest with the Catholic bishop of the Chicago diocese; as a result of his increasing impatience with hierarchical authority a majority of his parishioners withdrew from the Catholic church and in 1860 joined the Presbyterian or Baptist churches.[42] Father Chiniquy himself with 1,000 communicants from

[41] *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, January 24, 1854; *Illinois State Register*, January 26, 1854; *Peru Daily Chronicle*, February 1, 1854; *Rockford Register*, February 7, 1857; *St. Clair Tribune*, February 13, 20, 1857; *Illinois State Journal*, January 12, 19, 1859; *Chicago Democrat*, July 24, 1857.

[42] *Chicago Daily Journal*, November 13, 1850, June 18, 1851; *Illinois State Reg-*

the French churches of St. Anne and Kankakee became a part of the Presbyterian organization, and thirty-six young men of his flock offered themselves as candidates for the ministry.

Other French settlements were scattered over the state. A company of Trappist monks, direct from France, located near Beardstown in 1849, while Ottawa, already something of a French settlement, in 1859 welcomed the arrival of a large number of families of Waldenses from the Vaudois. Another Waldensian colony was established near Odell, in Livingston county, on the line of the Chicago and Alton railroad. At the same time a large body of French Canadians was assisted by wealthy French planters in Louisiana in establishing themselves at Tacusa on the Illinois Central to serve as a central depot for the deposit and distribution of the staples from Louisiana.[43]

Probably the most interesting French settlement in the state was the company of French communists who acquired the property of the Mormons at Nauvoo. In 1849, under the leadership of A. Charles Cabet, an Icarian colony established itself there; soon upon the fifteen acres of ground with its outlying farm 340 colonists were housed; the settlement, with the remodeled old Mormon temple as headquarters, had excellent educational facilities, a good library, together with workshops, mills, and a store in St. Louis for the sale of its textile manufactures. The progress of the colony was chronicled in its official paper, the *Popular Tribune*, edited by M. Cabet; later a German and a French weekly paper were added.

So well did the experiment succeed at the start—with a net profit of $9,000 for the year 1852—that it was arranged to make Nauvoo, as the parent colony, a place for the preparation of new colonists who would found similar establishments in Iowa and elsewhere. Soon, however, discussions arose over administrative matters, and the authority of Cabet was challenged by opponents who sought his overthrow; the opposition acquired a

ister, March 9, 1849; *Quebec Gazette* clipped in *Gem of the Prairie*, December 23, 1848; *Joliet Signal*, November 11, 1851; *Belleville Advocate*, September 1, 1852; *Chicago Press and Tribune*, December 1, 1859; January 18, 1860; *Presbytery Reporter*, 5: 126; *Canton Weekly Register*, September 18, 1860. Eight months after the establishment of the *Journal de L'Illinois*, it was transferred to Chicago. *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, January 6, September 9, 1857.

[43] *Beardstown Gazette*, January 10, 1849; *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, March 7, August 20, 1857; *Quincy Whig*, March 5, 1857.

majority and deposed Cabet shortly before his death in November, 1856. In resisting the leadership of Cabet, the rebels insisted upon the failure of the colony so aggressively that in spite of a considerable degree of prosperity, they succeeded in convincing even themselves of the truth of their assertions. They claimed that Cabet with his wild theories had fleeced fifteen hundred victims; they, therefore, petitioned for the repeal of the act of incorporation and removed to St. Louis.[44] This brought the complete ruin of Icaria; the faithful remained at Nauvoo but without spirit; farming operations were abandoned, and the property became heavily mortgaged. In August, 1859, they disposed of some goods at a public sale to satisfy a debt of $10,000 and a month later realized $10,000 on the remaining properties. Thus ended a promising experiment in the realization of a nineteenth century communistic Utopia.

During this decade Illinois acquired two Portuguese settlements, one in north Springfield and one in the vicinity of Jacksonville. In each case the settlers were Protestant Portuguese exiles from the island of Madeira; the first company of 200 arrived November 1, 1849, followed by groups of from 60 to 150, until each settlement numbered 500 persons. These exiles proved to be thrifty and industrious workers and rapidly attained material prosperity. They built homes for themselves and the Springfield group established a Portuguese school and church.[45]

So considerable an increase in the Scandinavian population was made during the fifties that by 1860 it numbered well over 10,000. The Norwegians located largely in and around Chicago. They began to arrive in numbers about 1848; a year later there were nearly 600 in Chicago and by 1853 a Norwegian paper, the *Banner of Freedom*, was started in that city. Toward the end of the decade the Norwegian population of Chicago was variously estimated at from two to twelve thousand, with three Norwegian churches in the city. Chicago acted as a great distributing station from which Norwegians were supplied to other regions of the state; Norse groups gathered at "Old Sangamon Town" and in the "Kincaid neighborhood" north of Athens. Most of them, however, hired out with the farmers, who were

[44] *New York Tribune* clipped in *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, November 18, 1852; *ibid.*, April 10, 1855, February 21, 1856, February 16, 1857.

[45] *Illinois Journal*, November 13, 14, 1849; May 1, 10, 1854; October 9, 1855.

so well satisfied with their work that some sent money to Norway to contract in advance for further help.[46] In 1850 the chief Swedish settlements were in Chicago, Rockford, Galesburg and Victoria in Knox county, Bishop Hill and Andover in Henry county, Lafayette in Stark county, Berlin, later Swedona, in Mercer county, and dispersed throughout these northern counties. Swedish churches were to be found in Rockford, Andover, and in Chicago with congregations in Moline, Galesburg, and in other communities. A Swedish journal, the *Swedish Republican,* was published at Galva in Henry county for over a year, but was removed to Chicago in 1857.[47]

The Bishop Hill colony five miles west of Galva was a settlement made in 1846 by hardy pioneers who left their native land with their leader, Eric Janson, to secure a religious toleration denied to them at home. The original settlement of 400 increased to 700 or 800 by the end of 1850, although over a hundred were lost in 1849, the cholera year, when sixty persons died in one week; the migration continued until 1854 by which time 1,000 Swedish exiles had chosen to join this colony. Here was another interesting experiment in communism. With a tract of 12,000 acres large scale agriculture was successfully practiced; in 1860 the settlers raised 3,000 acres of broom corn, 2,000 acres of wheat and of corn, and 2,000 in mixed crops, besides a considerable acreage of hay and pasture. Besides the brick, leather products, and other materials needed for local consumption, they manufactured 5,000 dozens of brooms annually, and produced some famous table linens, towels, and other needlework articles made from flax raised by the colony. The society attained its greatest economic prosperity in 1860, just before its dissolution and the repeal of its charter of incorporation. Its collapse was occasioned by internal dissension and a faction-

[46] *Chicago Democrat,* January 10, 1848, July 14, 15, 1852, August 15, 1859; *Chicago Daily Journal* clipped in *Illinois State Register,* August 9, 1848; *Chicago Press and Tribune,* September 4, 1858; Robert H. Clarkson to W. H. Swift, October 1, 1849, Swift manuscripts. Many Norwegians were inclined out of a sense of superiority to resent being confused with the Swedes, whose special susceptibility to "ship fever" or cholera on the ocean trip, they declared, arose from a want of cleanliness and from an addiction to strong liquor.

[47] *Illinois State Register,* January 10, August 22, 1850; *Chicago Daily Democratic Press,* April 15, 1856.

alism that increased until the community feature was abandoned in 1860 and 1861.[48]

The scattered English element in Illinois was promised an important accretion as a result of the building of the Illinois Central railroad. English capitalists interested in the Central first used every possible means to direct the attention of emigrants to the lands of the company; as a result in 1859 a large body of English farmers and mechanics began to settle in companies along that road south of Centralia; meanwhile the agents of the largest English stockholders elaborated a plan for making such settlement more attractive. A little later in the same year steps were taken in London toward the organization of the "Prairie Land and Emigration Company" with a capital of $2,500,000, the object of which was to purchase prairie land in Illinois and colonize it with English farmers.[49] Such inducements encouraged English emigrants until the civil war began; by 1860 they had reached a total of 41,745.

The great works of internal improvement of the forties had brought vast hordes of brawny Irish to the Illinois prairies, many of whom took their place in the permanent population of the state. A Chicago Hibernian benevolent emigrant society was organized in January, 1848, to encourage and assist immigrants seeking locations in the west. The railroad construction work of the fifties now offered employment to those still on the ground and attracted a new immigration, mainly of those unfortunates driven from home by the potato famine.[50] The Irish remained to a large extent a restless floating population, little attracted by agricultural opportunities, but looking primarily to the cities for the essence of real life; in 1860 they consti-

[48] *Chicago Democrat*, August 2, 1850; *DeBow's Review*, 9: 330; *Chicago Daily Journal* clipped in *Rockford Forum*, October 9, 1850; *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 17, 1860; *Rockford Register*, November 24, 1860; *Private laws of 1853*, 328-329; Stoneberg, "The Bishop Hill colony," in Kiner, *History of Henry county, Illinois* (Chicago, 1910), 638-645; Michael A. Mikkelson, *The Bishop Hill colony, a religious communistic settlement in Henry county, Illinois* (*Johns Hopkins studies in political and social science*, volume 10 — Baltimore, 1892).

[49] *Belleville Advocate*, April 16, 1859; *Mound City Emporium*, May 12, 1859; *Our Constitution*, May 14, August 6, 1859; *Chicago Press and Tribune*, May 17, August 5, 1859.

[50] *Gem of the Prairie*, January 29, February 5, 1848; *Illinois State Register*, March 24, 1853.

tuted four times as large an element of the population of Chicago as of the agricultural regions of Illinois.

There seemed to be two strains, sometimes combined in the same individuals, in the Irish population of the state. There were on the one hand the brilliant idealists who supported the cause of civil liberty and liberal institutions in all its forms and expressions, whether in the Irish struggle for independence or in the European contests for self-government. Their local and state Hibernian societies were important agencies for the expression of this high ideal as well as of the feeling of brotherhood among the Irish. Irish relief work was carried on, and men like Senator Shields held themselves in readiness to join in the redemption of their native land when the hour to strike should come.[51]

But to the people of Illinois the Irishman more often appeared in another guise. To them he was pictured as the noisy, quarrelsome seeker after excitement, who found it in the company of John Barleycorn, in bloody street brawls, and even in the lower depths of crime. When an overwhelming majority of the visitors at police court was repeatedly reported to be Irishmen, it was not surprising that the public should make such adverse deductions.[52] The common practice of contemporary journalists was reflected in the point raised by the *Chicago Tribune*, December 23, 1853: "Why do our police reports always average two representatives from 'Erin, the soft, green isle of the ocean,' to one from almost any other inhabitable land of the earth? . . . Why are the instigators and ringleaders of our riots and tumults, in nine cases out of ten, Irishmen?" There followed the report of a riot at La Salle and of the murder of a contractor by a set of Irishmen. The *Tribune*, aroused to the point of approving action under lynch law, declared: "Had the whole thirty-two prisoners that were taken been marched out and shot on the spot, as the citizens did the Driskells in Ogle County, some years ago, the public judgment would have sanctioned it at once."

A more careful analysis, however, revealed a situation that scarcely warranted such a superficial judgment. The railroad contractors were often shrewd schemers and hard men who

[51] *Aurora Beacon*, September 14, 1848; *Illinois Journal*, January 22, 1849.

[52] *Chicago Democrat*, December 17, 1849.

sought to impose upon the ignorant Irish laborers and to direct matters to their own advantage. Palpably unfair treatment was almost certain to arouse the temper of the hot-headed Irishman. As it was, however, thousands quietly submitted to conditions upon the public works that brought death or ill health, "from exposure to miasmi, bad accommodation in camps and shanties, and from improper diet;" when sickness fell upon them they were discharged and turned loose upon the world.[53] It is to be remembered, moreover, that the Irishmen who drew the fire of public criticism were largely members of the sturdy band of humble toilers, brutalized by the religious and political oppression and economic exploitation of their native Ireland and, in this land of opportunity which they had so eagerly sought, deprived of contact with the finer forces.

The German "forty-eighters," the unsuccessful revolutionists of 1848, fled to America in a steady stream and were led to Illinois by Friedrich Hecker, the organizer of the revolt in Baden. Conditions continued favorable to a heavy emigration of refugees from the political and economic oppressions of the fatherland. The German population of Illinois in 1860 was 130,804, with Chicago, Belleville, Galena, Quincy, Alton, Peoria, and Peru as the chosen places of settlement. This influx was directed to Illinois by the guidebooks of John Mason Peck and similar works. Charles L. Fleischman, United States consul at Stuttgart, prepared in 1850 to write an emigrant's guidebook exclusively on Illinois, having previously written two general works.[54]

Early in 1854 a number of prominent Chicago business men enlisted their support in a movement in favor of a law to create the office of commissioner of emigration, whose principal duty it should be to travel through Germany for the purpose of directing the stream of German emigration to Illinois. The *Illinois Staats-Zeitung*, however, opposed the move as a sharp business transaction and a political maneuver in the interest of ambitious local politicians. Nothing developed along this line; instead, taking their cue from the Irish, Chicago Germans organized a society for the protection of German immigrants arriving at that city and employed an agent to devote his time to the care

[53] *Illinois State Register*, December 22, 1853.

[54] Charles L. Fleischman to French, March 20, 1850, French manuscripts.

of the new arrivals.[55] Similar societies were organized at other points of German settlement and carried on an important relief work.

In this period a new center of German culture was developing at Chicago. There the Teutonic immigrants created a set of social institutions to which the familiar atmosphere of the fatherland was transplanted. German Lutheran churches and parochial schools under Lutheran preachers — the only schoolmasters — had appeared at an early date to perpetuate their fundamental social functions. Now the refinements which they had sorely missed in their new western home were enthusiastically added: a German theater which made brilliant the dramatic atmosphere of Chicago, an orchestra which built up a musical reputation for the city, and a *Männerchor* in which the lusty *Liedersingers* vied with each other in the attempt to produce a spirited ensemble. The German brass band, the German militia companies of black jäger rifles, of Washington rifles, of Washington grenadiers, and of Washington light cavalry were features of many a gay procession. A German Odd Fellow lodge fostered the fraternal spirit among these settlers in true American style. Meantime other German settlements were acquiring the same institutions and stimulating the spiritual development away from frontier conditions.

There was much of an atmosphere of revolutionary democracy in these German circles. The "forty-eighters" were full of the failure of their cause. Many were downhearted, but others looked upon their residence in the United States as a training for future revolutionary attempts. In 1852 they invited Dr. Gottfried Kinkel, the German revolutionist, to include different Illinois groups in his tour of the country to collect funds for the German revolutionary committee which they hoped would soon strike another blow. This erstwhile professor of history and literature at Bonn was welcomed at Chicago and Belleville with elaborate ovations, and generous contributions were made to his fund.[56]

The hopelessness of the revolutionary cause, however, caused

[55] *Chicago Daily Democratic Press*, February 2, June 19, 1854, November 5, 1857; *Free West*, February 23, May 18, 1854.

[56] Gustave Koerner, *Memoirs of Gustave Koerner, 1809-1896* (Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1909), 1:576, 580; Bess, *Eine populäre Geschichte der Stadt Peoria*, 434.

the German population in general to settle down into more conservative channels. The *Turnverein* was introduced into Illinois in 1851 with companies at Peoria and Chicago; Belleville and Springfield soon had their own German gymnastic companies. The Northwestern *Turnerbund* held its annual meeting in 1858 at Belleville, and in the following year the United States *Turner* organization met in convention as the guests of the Chicago society. The social democratic atmosphere of this movement, however, had not been transplanted to America; and the political significance of the movement was very slight. The meeting at Belleville was addressed by Friedrich Hecker of that city, one of the originators of the *Turner* movement in America; his brilliant attack upon Douglas and his plea for the republican party showed that American issues had replaced the problems of the fatherland in the minds of leading revolutionary exiles. In 1850, however, the centennial of Schiller's birth was commemorated in festivals at Chicago and Belleville which did much toward arousing a feeling for German nationality on a democratic basis.[57]

Rich as was the cultural atmosphere of their communities and content as they were with the surroundings they were able to create, these Germans could not confine their influence within these narrow barriers. Politically courted by both parties, their leaders took a prominent part in democratic politics and later transferred their allegiance to the new republican movement. Gustave Koerner continued a prominent figure in the politics of Illinois; with him were associated men like Caspar Butz, a prominent Chicago politician; George Schneider, editor of the *Illinois Staats-Zeitung*, and one of the founders of the republican party of Illinois; Friedrich Hecker, a republican elector on the Fremont ticket in 1856; and George Bunsen, an early advocate of a public school system, and an important influence in the educational development of the state. The German voters held the balance of power between the whig and democratic parties before 1856 and between the democratic and republican parties after that date. The democrats rewarded them by giving Koerner the lieutenant governorship in 1852, and the republicans in 1860 honored in the same way Francis Hoffman, a Chicago

[57] *Ibid.*, 2:45-50, 69.

banker and a former whig. The Lutheran and Catholic clergy exercised a strong political influence upon their congregations; being conservatives like the rest of their profession, they were slower to see that they were acting "*wickedly*, and against God's Holy will, by their supporting the Democratic party." Those in the outlying towns of Washington and Clinton counties were a unit for Buchanan in 1856, but in 1860 their ranks were broken as the result of an aggressive campaign by republican agents.[58]

The German press of Illinois, firmly grounded in this decade with a daily in every important center, showed better than anything else that the Germans had turned their backs upon Europe and taken up the political issues of the state and nation. These papers were naturally democratic organs until the slavery issue led them into the new republican party. The *Illinois Staats-Zeitung* was established at Chicago in 1848 and, under the editorial direction of George Schneider and his associates, wielded an important influence. It became a daily in 1851. Other experiments to establish German papers in Chicago inevitably failed after a short struggle. This was true in other Illinois German centers where a single paper was successfully established, and other attempts to enter the field fell stillborn.

As thus these different racial elements began to make potent their distinctive contributions to the evolution of the prairie state, it became increasingly evident that the simple society of the frontier was giving way to the complexity of a mature commonwealth.

Arthur C. Cole

University of Illinois
Urbana

[58] William H. Pickering to J. Gillespie, July 20, 1860, Gillespie manuscripts.

TRADE IN THE BLUE-GRASS REGION, 1810-1820[1]

In the north central section of Kentucky, in a territory drained by the branches of the Kentucky and Licking rivers, is the so-called Blue-Grass of the state. Stretching from the Ohio river to the foot hills of the Alleghenies, this region contains about one-seventh the area of the state, an area of peculiarly fertile, productive land. It is today tapped by railroads coming from every direction, but was a century and a quarter ago dependent on one slender line of communication, the Wilderness Trail, which offered a difficult and dangerous route to the immigrant and traveler. Yet over this trace, available at that time only to the pack horse or pedestrian, immigrants attracted by the fertility of the soil came in such numbers that in 1792 Kentucky was able to claim and secure admission as a state.[2] So rapid had been the development that, in the period from the first settlement in 1774 to 1790, Kentucky had attained a population of 73,000; and the Blue-Grass state had developed as an island of civilization in the wilderness.

The fact that the eastern end of the trail tapped the comparatively densely populated regions of Virginia and North Carolina was significant in the social and political development of the region, for it was immigrants from these states or their descendants who dominated the affairs of the state in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The character of its first settlers, its soil and location, all combined to give the Blue-Grass certain definite characteristics, and from the beginning it possessed an individuality that marked it and set it apart from other regions. Socially, politically, and economically this earliest of frontier communities west of the Alleghenies was unlike other frontier regions, and its reactions towards the problems of the period were not always the reactions of the typical frontier community.

Peculiarly important for historical consideration were the re-

[1] Read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Paul, May 10, 1918.

[2] Nathaniel S. Shaler, *Kentucky, a pioneer commonwealth* (Boston, 1885), 121.

actions of the Blue-Grass in the first part of the nineteenth century; its thoughts and acts determined or at least gave fundamental direction to Kentucky's policies, for at that period the Blue-Grass, much more definitely than today, dominated the political and social thinking of the state.

Economic pressure, expressed in terms of land hunger, was the prevailing motive back of the settlement of Kentucky, and it was economic conditions that largely determined the political thinking of the region. A study of these economic conditions may afford a clearer understanding of the direction of Kentucky's politics in the period that ended in the civil war, and may even explain some of the basic causes for Kentucky's neutrality during the early part of the struggle. Certainly an intensive study of this region in 1800-1820 makes more definite our understanding of Henry Clay; and the quality of Clay's statesmanship or the character of his opportunism may be better appreciated through a study of the economic conditions of this early period.

The Clays, Breckinridges, Shelbys, and other leaders had reached the Blue-Grass over the long and difficult Wilderness Trail, and this first-hand knowledge of the thin and uncertain line of communication with the east gave them a very real and vital interest in transportation. As early as 1793 the Lexington club had resolved that those living on the Mississippi had the undeniable right to navigate its waters, and that the United States ought to demand this right of Spain.[3] This demand for the navigation of the Mississippi furnished fruitful soil for political agitation and ultimately led to the Louisiana purchase in 1803. In the meantime, however, the inhabitants of the Blue-Grass were interested in other projects.[4] The feasibility of an overland road and the attachment to the mother state, Virginia, kept alive interest in the Wilderness Trail, and in the early nineties private subscriptions were raised to improve the trail. In 1795 the state appropriated two thousand pounds to convert it into a wagon road — an amount woefully inadequate for the purpose. There were not sufficient funds or credit in the community to improve this route adequately, and even after 1795 the constant stream of immigrants traveled largely without vehicles — on

[3] *Ibid.*, 128.
[4] *Ibid.*, 132 ff.

horseback or afoot. Many merchants followed the old trace, for, though the bulky exports found their way down the Mississippi, the less bulky imports came in often by pack horse through the wilderness, and Spanish dollars given in exchange for Kentucky tobacco at New Orleans found their way to the exporters of Richmond, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. Distances were so great and the difficulties of transportation so numerous that prices on imports were exorbitant, while the cost of transportation absorbed most of the profits on the bulky exported commodities. The balance of trade seemed always against the Kentuckian, hence there grew up an insistent demand for the development of local manufactures. In 1789 an association was formed by the inhabitants of the Blue-Grass to discourage the use of rum, brandy, gauze, silk, lace, and broadcloth;[5] and in 1790 the Kentucky society for the encouragement of manufactures met at Danville and sent the first dues collected to Philadelphia to procure spinning and carding machines and stocking looms.[6] These efforts soon bore fruit, and by 1800 there had already appeared in the pages of the *Kentucky Gazette* advertisements of home-manufactured hats,[7] clothing, paper,[8] leather,[9] and spinning-wheels.[10] Though somewhat removed from the supply of coal and iron, the Blue-Grass was interested in the manufacture of ironware, and in 1802 one Ed West, of Lexington, invented a successful nail-cutting machine. The manufacturing establishments set up in Lexington and other Blue-Grass towns were usually small, local concerns that employed but few people and had a very limited output. The bulk of manufactured goods still came from the outside, and in 1802 it was estimated that England contributed seventy per cent of the goods used in this section of Kentucky.[11] This demand for English wares and other goods of finer quality than could be produced in the home manufactories was a heavy drain on the capital of a

[5] *Kentucky Gazette,* August 29, 1789.

[6] *Ibid.,* February 13, 1790.

[7] *Ibid.,* January 26, 1788.

[8] *Ibid.,* September 22, 1787.

[9] *Ibid.,* October 6, 1787.

[10] *Ibid.,* September 1, 1787.

[11] *Ibid.,* September 10, 1802. Much of the goods included the finer materials such as velvets, moreens, silks, and other goods that could not be produced in Kentucky.

frontier community, and there was constant agitation against it. Henry Clay, who had already attained a place as a political leader in the Blue-Grass, in 1809 presented a resolution to the state assembly that after June 20, 1809, the members of the assembly should, as an example to others, wear home-made apparel.[12] In 1810 merchants and manufacturers held a meeting in Lexington to consider the propriety of writing a memorial to congress in behalf of the protection of domestic manufactures,[13] and in the same year the editor of the *Gazette*, in a strong editorial, endorsed the protective policy, pointing out the mutual dependence of the laborer, the manufacturer, and the farmer.[14] Again, in 1811 Lewis Saunders and one hundred and twelve others petitioned congress for the protection of manufactures. This communication, others of the same purport, and the editorial comment, indicated a considerable unanimity of opinion in the region that had Lexington as its center. In fact, this isolated frontier community seemed to be the first in the United States to give solid support to the idea of protection.

This almost unanimous insistence upon protection was due largely to the continued isolation of the Blue-Grass and the realization that real prosperity must come either through a decrease in the cost of transportation or through the development of home industry. Clay was already appearing as the champion of his section, and the germ of the American system appears in his speeches in congress in 1811 and 1812, advocating internal improvements and the protection of home industry.[15] Representative Porter of Kentucky gave expression to the desires of his region, when he called attention to trade conditions and indicated that the great evil from which the people of the west suffered was want of a market. In his speech in congress he declared that "the single circumstance of the want of a market is already beginning to produce the most disastrous effect, not only on industry, but on the morals of the inhabitants. Such is the fertility of their land that one-half of their time spent in labor is sufficient to produce every article which their farms are

[12] *Ibid.*, January 24, 1809.

[13] *Ibid.*, September 25, 1810.

[14] *Ibid.*, September 18, 1810.

[15] Carl Schurz, *Life of Henry Clay* (New York, 1887), 1:53 ff. Clay did not at this time favor the national bank.

capable of yielding, in sufficient quantity for their own consumption, and there is nothing to incite them to produce more. They are, therefore, naturally led to spend the other part of their time in idleness and dissipation."[16]

This speech suggests the real problem for the Blue-Grass, as well as for the west in general, the problem of transportation. In 1810 the Wilderness Trail was still used by people traveling eastward, and specie was carried over this route because of its greater safety; but in the transportation of commodities the river system was used as extensively as possible. The bulky products of the Blue-Grass were floated down to New Orleans on flatboats, while imports came overland from Philadelphia or Baltimore to Pittsburg and from thence were carried down the Ohio to Maysville on the northeastern edge of the Blue-Grass. The goods were then carried overland from Maysville to Lexington, the distributing center for the Blue-Grass. The interior rivers, like the Kentucky, Licking, and their branches, were not used in the import trade in 1810 because artificial means to stem their current had not yet been introduced; but export goods were floated down their courses and at the mouths of various rivers depots were established to handle this trade.

Lexington as a distributing center in 1810 carried on the import trade of the region, and retail merchants did a thriving business; some of them in the fall and winter did a business estimated at one hundred thousand dollars a month. Due to the cost of transportation and lack of competition, prices for imported goods were necessarily high; this cost could not be offset by the prices exacted for domestic goods, for, again, the cost of getting bulky farm products to a market allowed only a very small margin of profit above the cost of production. The only article that could be sent east and still bear a profit was ginseng; the cost of transporting other goods to New Orleans added from fifty to one hundred per cent to the price.[17]

The cost of transportation from the east to the Blue-Grass was estimated at $65 a ton; an average of $10,000 was spent every day in bringing goods over the mountains, an expense that

[16] *Annals of congress,* 1810, 2:1385.

[17] As late as 1815 even the mail deliveries were irregular and uncertain. See complaints in *Kentucky Gazette,* March 13, 27, 1815.

increased the cost of commodities by at least one-third. The danger of loss or destruction to goods was by no means a small one, and this risk was visited upon the consumer in the shape of high prices.[18] The existence of this unfavorable balance of trade resulted in the expansion of local industries, and Lexington developed into a manufacturing as well as a distributing center. Establishments employing two or three men were expanded into factories employing fifty men or more, and their products were sent to all sections of central Kentucky and north central Tennessee.[19] Louisville, Cincinnati, and even Pittsburg were using Lexington-produced nails as late as 1815.[20] Cuming, Melish, and other travelers of the period commented on the remarkable development of Lexington, and it was hailed as the coming metropolis of the west. In fact, in 1816 Lexington attained recognition as the leading city in the trans-Allegheny country, when *Niles' Register* referred to it as the "metropolis of the West, where town lots sell nearly as high as in Boston, New York and Philadelphia." The same paper in the following year noted in the city the existence of six steam factories of considerable size, and commented on its thriving industries.[21] The industrial development of Lexington had reached its crest, however, and factories with a capitalization of two and a half millions were producing more manufactured goods than the Lexington of today.

During the same period the Blue-Grass, with Lexington as the center, was the dominant political section; and policies were settled by the leaders of this region. The constant demand of central Kentucky was protection of home industry, and *Niles' Register* was no more insistent on this policy than was the *Kentucky Gazette.* The embargo was hailed and defended as a most desirable protective measure, and Kentucky's politicians were supported or condemned in accordance with their vote for or against it.[22] When the measure failed, the protective tariff

[18] See prices of goods at Lexington, *Kentucky Gazette,* May 16, 1809. Bacon per pound, 6 to 8 cents, beef per pound, 4 to 8 cents, butter per pound, 12 cents, corn per barrel, 25 to 37 cents, flour per hundred weight, $2.00 to $4.00, fowls per pair, 8 to 25 cents, whiskey per gallon, 25 to 37 cents.

[19] See advertisements in *Kentucky Gazette* for 1810-1811.

[20] Shaler, *Kentucky,* 175.

[21] *Niles' Register,* June 15, 1816.

[22] *Kentucky Gazette,* July 17, 1813.

and internal improvements were championed; and every public meeting in the Blue-Grass of this period was featured by toasts to protection and internal improvements.[23] New England was especially denounced for its attitude towards the embargo and the tariff,[24] and even other sections of Kentucky came in for some share of criticism. In reply there were strong denunciations of the Lexington junto and its attempt to influence the whole state, and the editor of the *Gazette* complained that "Lexington dictation" and "Lexington influence" had become the cant phrases of the political backslider.[25] In Kentucky the chief rival of Lexington was the rapidly developing river town of Louisville, and in 1816 these cities engaged in a struggle for the United States bank then located at Lexington. Lexington was able to maintain its claim to the bank against this presumptuous rival, designated by the editor of the *Gazette* "a city of ponds," with little manufacturing, and occupied chiefly with carrying goods around the falls for strangers.[26]

It was this very location at the falls which gave Louisville a strategic position when the steamboat traffic developed. In August, 1815, the *Gazette* gave an account of the first steamboat trip from Pittsburg to New Orleans and return,[27] and in the same year Governor Shelby of Kentucky mentioned the need for internal improvements and called attention to the recent experiments in steamboat traffic.[28] By 1816 the ultimate success of the steamboat on western waters was assured; boats were building at five or six points along the Ohio, and at Cincinnati a company had already been formed for the joint purpose of establishing a steamship line and engaging in trade.[29] It was estimated that carriage by steamboat would reduce the cost of transportation fifty per cent,[30] and this would naturally redound tremendously

[23] *Ibid.*, 1814-1820.
[24] *Ibid.*, May 9, 1814.
[25] *Ibid.*, January 17, 1814.
[26] *Ibid.*, August 19, 1816.
[27] *Ibid.*, August 7, 1815.
[28] *Ibid.*, December 11, 1815.
[29] *Ibid.*
[30] In the *Gazette* of September 18, 1815, it was advocated that all goods be imported from New Orleans because the balance of trade would be better maintained and freight charges would be less. It was estimated that merchants paid an average of $10 per 100 pounds for transportation of goods from the east.

to the advantage of river towns. Even the most ardent supporter of the Blue-Grass could not fail to recognize the situation, when he found that tobacco which brought $4.00 per hundredweight at Lexington brought $6.00 at Louisville,[31] the $2.00 margin representing a cost for transportation greater than the cost for shipment by steamboat from Louisville to New Orleans. The failure of the Blue-Grass adherents to secure permanent improvements in the Kentucky river and the slow development of the turnpike road[32] allowed the great bulk of trade and manufacturing to swing definitely away from the region. But the ideal of commercial and industrial supremacy still lingered with its leaders. The protective tariff and internal improvements were still the prevailing toasts at all gatherings;[33] members of the legislature were asked to clothe themselves in home-produced goods,[34] and bills were presented for the development of turnpikes and improvement of rivers.[35]

In the meantime the Ohio traffic had developed apace, the Louisville correspondence of May 8, 1818, noting five steamboats en route up or down the river;[36] in the same year seven boats were in course of construction in the Louisville yards, and there was corresponding activity all along the Ohio.[37] As the tide of river traffic swelled, the position of the Blue-Grass trader and manufacturer became increasingly difficult. Tobacco buyers labored to prove that it was cheaper to handle tobacco by way of Lexington than to send it direct to Louisville;[38] and it was argued that it was cheaper to convert wheat into flour at Lexington than to ship it direct to Louisville where it could be ground for the southern or eastern market.[39]

But neither sectional enthusiasm nor personal desire could change the course of the Ohio or alter economic law, and Lexington and the Blue-Grass had to accept the inevitable. By

[31] *Ibid.*, March 27, 1818.

[32] Lexington was connected by stage with Louisville and Maysville by 1818, but the service was intermittent. See *ibid.*, March 27, 1818.

[33] *Ibid.*, January 13, 1817, May 28, 1818.

[34] *Ibid.*, July 16, 1817.

[35] *Ibid.*, December 27, 1817.

[36] *Ibid.*, May 8, 1818.

[37] *Ibid.*, October 25, 1818.

[38] *Ibid.*, March 17, 1817.

[39] *Ibid.*, December 16, 1816.

June, 1818, many of the advertisements of local manufactories had disappeared from the *Gazette*, and the evidence indicates that others were making a last spasmodic effort to survive. In February, 1818, the important Saunders woolen company hoped to rehabilitate itself by reorganizing with a capital of $300,000,[40] but the attempt was vain, and in 1819 this factory with a physical valuation of $150,000 was sold at auction for $21,000 to satisfy a debt.[41] A cotton factory at Versailles in the Blue-Grass suspended operations and was advertised for sale or rent.[42] Cotton bagging factories numbering eight in 1817 decreased to one in 1820, and virtually all advertisements of local manufactories disappeared from the pages of the *Gazette* by 1820. Thus a community that in 1815 boasted of brass and iron foundries,[43] woolen,[44] cotton, and paper mills,[45] and even a pianoforte manufactory,[46] was practically divested of them by 1820,[47] and even the hemp and woolen mills dependent on local raw materials failed.[48]

To complete the ruin wrought in the Blue-Grass industrial and commercial interests, the monetary difficulties of the period culminated with the panic of 1819, and the ensuing economic depression affected the social and political thinking of the whole state. Depreciated currency flooded the community, banks suspended, and business was so thoroughly disturbed that the manufacturing institutions that still maintained a precarious existence were forced to discontinue.[49]

Even in the face of difficulty and disaster the people of the Blue-Grass clung to their old policies. In a celebration of the fourth of July for 1819, the toast was, "Hard times: Economy, the encouragement of domestic manufactures and home labor

[40] *Ibid.*, February 7, 1818.

[41] *Ibid.*, May 7, 1819.

[42] *Ibid.*, June 11, 1819.

[43] *Ibid.*, December 19, 1814.

[44] *Ibid.*, September 18, 1810, November 29, 1817.

[45] *Ibid.*, September 9, 1816.

[46] *Ibid.*, September 24, 1805, December 2, 1816.

[47] Other manufactories in 1815 included a chair factory, white lead factory, and flour mills.

[48] *Ibid.*, August 17, 1820. At this time one company, the Prentiss woolen company, was still in existence.

[49] George W. Rauck, *History of Lexington, Kentucky* (Cincinnati, 1872), 297.

the best cure."[50] Home manufactured articles to supplant the expensive imported goods were insistently and enthusiastically advocated. Ladies' hats made of local grass were commended as equal in every respect to the finest Leghorn, on which the women of the region were said to spend $1,000,000 a year; buckeye nuts were recommended for starch making, and roasted barley was suggested as a substitute for coffee.[51] The cost of transportation to Lexington kept prices of imports at an exorbitant figure, while exports were abnormally low in price. As against the price of tea at $3.00, coffee 74 cents, and sugar 37 cents a pound, can be placed the value of Blue-Grass corn and wheat at twelve and one-half cents and thirty-seven and one-half cents per bushel respectively.[52] The shift in trade and the consequent loss of commercial and manufacturing opportunities left a permanent impress upon the Blue-Grass. By 1820 Cincinnati had attained a population four times that of Lexington,[53] while Louisville had outstripped her in industry and commerce.[54] Lexington was henceforth only a local distributing center and the metropolis of the Blue-Grass.

The success of the steamboat did much to determine the lines of travel and the direction of social and economic forces for the future. The Wilderness Trail, though occasionally utilized, fell more and more into disuse. The trail of the immigrant was now down the Ohio; and the settlers, many of them from the north Atlantic seaboard, brought with them ministers, teachers, and other leaders representing a different culture from that of Virginia or Carolina. The rich lands of the Blue-Grass were already occupied, and so the immigrant farmer turned his attention to the north and west; but many of the intellectual leaders, carried along with the westward movement, were attracted by the social and intellectual standards of the community and sought places in the Blue-Grass.

The two great educational influences of Kentucky, Transylvania university and Centre college, were largely directed by

[50] *Kentucky Gazette,* July 16, 1819.

[51] *Ibid.,* November 10, 1818.

[52] Rauck, *History of Lexington,* 297. Other prices in 1819 were: pork per hundred weight, $1.25, eggs per dozen, 3 cents, butter per pound, 6 cents, milch cows each $7 to $10.

[53] *Ibid.,* 241.

[54] Louisville manufactures developed rapidly after 1818.

presidents recruited from the northern states, men who in some cases, like President John C. Young of Centre college, became active champions of the gradual abolition movement. Certainly the attitude of such leaders, aligned as they were with some of the leading families of the Blue-Grass, affected the political thinking of the region; and if the change in the tide of immigration brought in new intellectual influences, it implied economic changes as well. The extension of the canal system in New York and Pennsylvania strengthened the trade relations with the north, and Cincinnati became the depot for goods bound to or from central Kentucky. When the railroad appeared, lines of communication and distributing centers had been well established, and it showed a tendency to follow lines of trade already laid down. The attempts of the "cotton south" to build up a competing traffic with Kentucky were largely abortive.

The traditions and social institutions of Kentucky were still those of the south, but the new intellectual and economic interests were aligned with the north, and the newer influences proved the stronger. The geographical isolation of the Blue-Grass from other proslavery territory does not tell the whole story, for the political leadership of the section was still potent enough to have swung the state into line with the south, if its people had been whole-heartedly in support of such a measure. Economic necessity and the new intellectual influences played no unimportant part in the final decision, for by 1860 those forces, just emerging in 1820, were important factors in determining the political action of the state.

Theodore G. Gronert

Centre College
Danville, Kentucky

THE NORTHERN RAILROADS AND THE CIVIL WAR[1]

The opening of the civil war found the railroads fully developed to meet the needs of the government. In the states north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi, with the exception of Michigan and Wisconsin, all the main lines were completed and in operation. In the east the great trunk lines, the New York Central, the Erie, the Pennsylvania, had begun to consolidate and to absorb the smaller roads. Only further consolidation, the addition of small branch and connecting lines, and the laying of additional trackage on the main lines were needed to complete the railroad system as it is today.

So at least it would appear from a casual survey of railroad maps of 1861 and 1918. There were, however, some very decided differences between the railroads of the war decade and those of the present. In the first place, there was little uniformity of gauge. In New England the 4′ 8½″ gauge was almost universal. The same gauge was common in Indiana and Illinois. In Ohio, however, 4′ 10″ was the rule, while in the middle states it varied with the different systems. There were in all in the northern states at least seven different gauges. The result was that goods had to be re-shipped at each change of gauge, a delay which could only be avoided by the use of an additional rail or an adjustable car whose wheels could be shifted.

Then, too, there was little uniformity in running time. Each road ran its trains by the clock in its principal depot, an arrangement which, since standard time had not been developed, was confusing in the extreme to the uninformed traveller. *Appleton's railroad guide* attempted to provide a remedy by means of a chart showing the relative time in the principal cities of the country.[2]

[1] This article aims to treat the railroads north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi rivers in their relation to the civil war. The roads located in regions which were the seat of continued military operations are omitted because they are more properly associated with the military railroads operated by the United States government.

[2] *Appletons' railway and steam navigation guide* (New York, 1859), 27.

In addition to the lack of uniformity in time and gauge, there were a number of obstacles to rapid and efficient transportation. Most of the roads, particularly in New England and regions remote from the coal fields, still used wood as fuel for their engines. The Hartford, Providence and Fishkill railroad as late as 1867 did not have a single coal burning locomotive.[3] The larger roads, however, were rapidly adapting their engines to the use of soft coal; and anthracite was being tried.[4] The smoke and sparks from the wood-burning engines gave the principal cities just ground for requiring the companies to draw their trains by horse power after entering the city, another hindrance to rapid transportation.[5] Then, too, all the smaller roads ran on a single track. Most of the larger roads had begun the construction of a second track, but in no case was it completed the entire length of the road. The Pennsylvania railroad, which was one of the leading roads in this and other respects, had 262 miles of double track on 331 miles of road in 1861.[6] Not all the rivers were bridged, so that the cars were frequently transported by ferries which were sometimes impeded by ice.[7]

As might be expected, these weaknesses did not tend to develop speed in the civil war railroads. The highest speed claimed by any road in New York state was forty-three miles an hour, attained by the express trains of the Hudson River railroad when in motion. Including stops, the speed was thirty-seven miles an hour.[8] This was exceptional; the average speed of an ordinary passenger train in New York state was twenty miles and the

[3] *Annual report of the Rhode Island railroad commissioners made to the legislature* (Providence, 1868), 42.

[4] *Report of the president and managers of the Philadelphia and Reading railroad to the stockholders January 14, 1861* (Philadelphia, 1861), 22; *Boston Commercial Bulletin*, February 28, 1863, reports a hard coal burner being constructed for the Central railroad of New Jersey.

[5] *Report of the directors of the Boston and Maine railroad to the stockholders September 13, 1854* (Boston, 1854), 8; *Boston Commercial Bulletin*, June 20, 1863.

[6] *Fourteenth annual report of the board of directors of the Pennsylvania railroad to the stockholders, February 4, 1861* (Philadelphia, 1861), 53.

[7] On the line between New York and Baltimore, ferries were used to cross both the Delaware and Susquehanna rivers. *Reports of the house of representatives*, 37 congress, 3 session, no. 63, p. 2.

[8] *Annual report of the state engineer and surveyor of the state of New York and of the tabulations and deductions from the reports of the railroad corporations* (Albany, 1861), 360.

average speed of a freight train in motion fourteen.[9] In Massachusetts, there were freight trains running as slow as seven miles an hour.[10]

Some of the smaller roads were in a bad state. The Cincinnati, Wilmington and Zanesville is a good example of a poorly managed road. Of all its engines only three were in order. At Zanesville it had no freight house and received and discharged all freight in the street with the result that in wet weather business was entirely suspended. The accounts were not well kept. There were no proper files of letters. The employees, at one time, had four months pay coming to them.[11]

With all these weaknesses the transportation system, with perhaps a single exception, proved adequate to the needs of the government. It not only furnished transportation for troops and supplies but at the same time it shipped to the eastern ports the food products of the northwest destined for European consumption. All this was done without overburdening the railroads. Why?

In the first place, there was a fairly even distribution of shipping. The railroads running north and south were depended upon for government transportation while those running east and west carried the agricultural products of the west to the eastern ports. In no case was there concentration on any one line or to any one port. In the one instance where the entire burden was placed upon a single line of road, that line proved inadequate: in the winter of 1861 and 1862, when the confederates blockaded the Potomac, the roads connecting New York with Washington proved unequal to the task of transporting all the necessary supplies.[12] Again, when the Potomac was blocked by ice in January, 1864, the attempt was made to bring all supplies into Washington by rail. After a week of the blockade, the chief quartermaster of the Washington depot reported that he had received by railroad up to that time less than twenty cars of forage

[9] *Ibid.*, 326.

[10] *Returns of the railroad corporations in Massachusetts, 1860, together with abstracts of the same* (Boston, 1861), 3.

[11] *Report of the Cincinnati, Wilmington and Zanesville railroad company January 1st, 1857* (New York, 1857), 61-66. For a more detailed description of the condition of the northern railroads at this time see Carl R. Fish, "The northern railroads, April, 1861," in *American historical review*, 22: 778-793.

[12] *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, March 4, 1862.

while the army required seventy-four carloads of grain and three hundred and seventy-five carloads of hay, daily. The situation was relieved only by a rise in the temperature and by the breaking up of the ice.[13]

It was indeed only owing to the fact that a very large share of the transportation of supplies and troops was done by water that the railroads proved as generally adequate as they did. In 1864, the quartermaster reported that the government owned and employed on the coast a fleet of thirty-nine ocean steamers, forty-five river and bay steamers, twenty steam tugs, two barks, two brigs, twenty-one schooners, and twenty-nine barges with an aggregate burden of 43,729 tons. In addition, there was a chartered fleet of 158,694 tons burden.[14] In the west, also, a large portion of the transportation was by water. The following figures from the report of Colonel Charles Parsons, who was in charge of transportation at St. Louis, show the relative use of rail and water in that district for the year ending June 30, 1863: subsistence, ordnance, quartermaster's, and medical store transported by rail totalled 153,102,100 pounds, by river 337,912,363 pounds; troops by rail 193,023, by river 135,909.[15]

At the close of the war, when the troops were sent home to their rendezvous for disbanding, it was recommended by General Meigs that water transportation be used wherever possible since he considered it both cheaper and more comfortable for the soldiers.[16] It seems clear that water was an important factor in the transportation problems of the war and that the railroads still remained complementary to the older forms of transportation.

Still another reason why the railroads proved adequate to the situation was the fact that they had been overdeveloped in the previous decade and at the opening of the war were not operating to full capacity. This is clearly brought out by the fact that, although their business increased enormously during the war, the railroads were able to handle it without a proportional increase in rolling stock. For example, the earnings of the

[13] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies* (Washington, 1880-1901), third series, 4: 48.

[14] *Ibid.*, third series, 1: 890.

[15] *Ibid.*, first series, 3: part 1, 707.

[16] *Ibid.*, third series, 4: 302.

Pennsylvania railroad jumped from five million dollars in 1860 to seventeen millions in 1865; while the rolling stock, which had included 205 engines, 154 passenger cars, and 2,047 freight cars in 1860,[17] had only been increased to 368 engines, 150 passenger cars, and 4,842 freight cars.[18] Similarly, the New York Central doubled its earnings with an increase of only forty-two engines.[19] The aggregate rolling stock of all the railroads in the state of Pennsylvania in 1860 consisted of 623 engines, 410 passenger cars, 6,028 freight cars.[20] In 1865, it consisted of 1,519 engines, 700 passenger cars, and 15,288 freight cars.[21] The aggregate receipts had advanced from twenty-one to sixty-five million dollars.[22] In each of these instances, with triple the business, it was only necessary approximately to double the number of engines and freight cars, clearly showing that the roads were not being used to capacity at the beginning of the war.

As might be expected, since the railroads proved adequate to the situation, the government did not exercise any real supervision over them. The act of January 31, 1862, however, gave the president the authority to take military possession of all the railroads in the United States, and on May 25 General Meigs issued an order taking such possession and ordering the railroads "to hold themselves in readiness for the transportation of troops and munitions of war" to the exclusion of all other business.[23]

Notwithstanding this order, actual control was exercised only in the regions where military operations required it. A message of Stanton to Vice President Scott of the Pennsylvania railroad, August 19, 1862, is characteristic: "The urgent exi-

[17] *Reports of the several railroad companies whose roads lie in whole, or in part, within the limits of Pennsylvania, communicated by the auditor general to the legislature January 16, 1861* (Harrisburg, 1861), 102.

[18] *Reports of the several railroad and canal companies of Pennsylvania for the year 1865 communicated by the auditor general* (Harrisburg, 1865), 416.

[19] *Annual report of the engineer and surveyor of New York state, 1861* (Albany, 1861), 149, 159; *ibid.*, 1866 (Albany, 1866), 378, 384.

[20] *Reports of the several railroad companies whose roads lie in whole, or in part, within the limits of Pennsylvania, communicated by the auditor general to the legislature January 16, 1861*, 165.

[21] *Reports of the several railroad and canal companies of Pennsylvania for the year 1865, communicated by the auditor general*, 438-440.

[22] *Ibid.*, 458.

[23] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies*, third series, 2: 69.

gency requires that all railroad power and business should be devoted exclusively to the transportation of troops this week. Will you be so good as to give it your attention."[24] This method was apparently satisfactory, for General Meigs reported that the services required by the government had been performed "zealously and satisfactorily."[25]

In some cases, the government did take actual control. The thirty miles of road from Hanover Junction to Gettysburg was operated as a military road from July 9 to August 1, 1863, for the removal of wounded soldiers. During the occupation about fifteen thousand five hundred wounded men were transported over this line. The equipment and men were furnished from the military roads of Virginia.[26]

In the case of the railroads between New York and Washington, which, as has been stated, proved inadequate in an emergency, the government, or more strictly congress, attempted to put pressure upon them by threat of adding a competing line. This proposal immediately aroused the wrath of these roads. The New Jersey railroad and transportation company asserted that the demands of the government had been met with promptness and assiduity, that a number of troops had been carried without payment and that "associated capital invested in public works is not to be employed as a charity but is a trust, the use of which calls for remuneration."[27] The state directors of the Camden and Amboy railroad of New Jersey said that the construction of the proposed road would release that road from its obligations to the state and so should be opposed by the state. They thought that the courtesy due a sovereign state demanded that a power of this doubtful character should not be exercised and most certainly could not be delegated to third parties. This feature, to their mind, created a strong "suspicion that there are other ingredients mingled in the movement besides those of devotion and regard to the national welfare."[28]

Congress went so far as to appoint a select committee on the

[24] *Ibid.*, third series, 2: 409.

[25] *Ibid.*, third series, 2: 795.

[26] *Ibid.*, third series, 5: 976.

[27] *Reports of the directors of the New Jersey railroad and transportation company to the stockholders* (Newark, N. J., 1861), 6.

[28] *Annual report of the state directors of the Delaware and Raritan canal and Camden and Amboy railroad companies for the year 1863* (Trenton, 1864), 7.

subject. The committee reported favorably, alleging that the present communication was inadequate, that there were three breaks in the line, one at Baltimore, one at Susquehanna and one at Philadelphia, causing a delay of at least two and one-half hours, and that the fares for passengers and freight were twenty-five per cent higher than for an equal distance on other roads. Private enterprise and capital existed ready to start construction as soon as government sanction and authority was received.[29] If the proposed step had been taken, it might have led to an earlier recognition of the necessity of national regulation of railroads, though it would certainly have stirred up a great deal of active hostility.

One important problem in the relationship between the railroads and the government was the question of the rates to be paid by the government for services rendered by the roads. Colonel Thomas A. Scott, who had been appointed by Cameron in the early part of the war to take charge of the government railways, issued directions to be observed in making settlements with railroads. Passengers were to be carried at the rate of two cents per mile per person. Equipment, munitions, and supplies accompanying troops were to be paid for at first class local rates. Other goods were to be carried at local rates according to classification by the road. Estimates of what these rates should average were appended to the order.[30]

The Illinois Central, which was a land grant railroad, was on a different basis. The directors telegraphed to Secretary of War Cameron April 26, 1861 to the effect that they were ready at any time to set aside the regular business and afford the government every facility. As regarded rates, they said that they would keep an account of the service rendered "and leave the adjustment of the compensation for the use of its rolling stock to be arranged in the future."[31] An arrangement was made

[29] *Reports of the house of representatives,* 37 congress, 3 session, no. 63.

[30] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* third series, 1: 325. The two cent rate for passengers was less than the rates usually charged which averaged on the roads in Pennsylvania two and a half or three cents a mile. *Reports of the several railroad companies whose roads lie, in whole or in part, within the limits of Pennsylvania, communicated by the auditor general to the legislature January 16, 1861.*

[31] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* third series, 1: 121.

with this road by which the government was charged one-third less than other patrons, this discount representing the right of the government to use the roadway as provided in the charter.[32]

The only evidence of any attempt on the part of the railroads to defraud the government or to demand extortionate rates was in the case of the roads between Baltimore and New York. Cameron reported to the president that six dollars had been charged for the transportation of each soldier over that route and, as this seemed extravagant, an arrangement had been made by which the troops were taken via Harrisburg for four dollars, a method which was said to have brought the other roads to terms.[33] Cameron's statement, however, was disputed by the New Jersey railroad and transportation company, which asserted that "prices between New York and Baltimore have, with the exception of the first regiment carried, been according to the tariff for passengers as furnished by the government and less than the tariff for freight."[34] The charge of extortion was also denied by the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore railroad.[35] Mr. Felton, president of this road, charged that this change of route was due to Cameron's desire to benefit roads in which he was financially interested.[36]

Scott's method of paying the railroads the same rates they charged others was undoubtedly the best preliminary arrangement which could have been made. The only other thing which could have been done would have been to postpone settlement till a future date. Such action might have been unfortunate and would probably have antagonized the business men at a time when the government most needed their support. Congress, however, seems to have considered Scott's action worthy of in-

[32] *Ibid.*, third series, 1: 751.

[33] *Ibid.*, third series, 1: 705. The second regiment of Rhode Island volunteers was ordered to be brought via New Jersey Central, East Pennsylvania and Northern Central railroad companies. *Ibid.*, third series, 1: 228.

[34] *Report of the directors of the New Jersey railroad and transportation company to the stockholders* (Newark, 1862), 7.

[35] *Twenty-fifth annual report of the president and directors to the stockholders of the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore railroad company* (Philadelphia, 1863), 10.

[36] *Private and official correspondence of Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, during the period of the civil war*, edited by Jesse Ames Marshall ([Norwood, Mass.], 1917), 1: 171.

vestigation,[37] and at least one individual considered him a "corrupt lobby-jobber."[38]

Cameron retired as secretary of war in January, 1862. *Harper's weekly* in comment said, "The public will not regret the change, nor is it believed the country will be the loser by it."[39] Scott, however, remained in office until the following June, being sent at this time to investigate conditions in the west.[40]

One of the first acts of Stanton was the issuing of an invitation to the chief officers of the railroads in the loyal states to meet in Washington on February 20.[41] This convention met as called, and it was said that seven hundred million of railroad interest out of the nine hundred million of such interest in the loyal states was represented by the delegates.[42] A committee was appointed by the delegates which reported a schedule of rates immediately adopted by the convention. The rate for passengers was fixed at two cents a mile, eighty pounds of baggage being allowed to each soldier. The government was given a discount of 10 per cent on the rates for freight which was to be classified according to the schedules of the four trunk lines, and a maximum charge was fixed. It was provided that the full length should govern whether the freight passed over one or many roads, the distance in each case being determined by the shortest line. It was made the duty of each company to furnish the secretary of war and the quartermaster general with copies of their through and local tariffs and to notify them of any changes. A committee was to be appointed to coöperate with the government and to take such action as was necessary to produce harmonious results.[43] The agreement reached at this

[37] *House executive documents*, 37 congress, 2 session, 1: no. 18.

[38] *Diary of Gideon Welles, secretary of the navy under Lincoln and Johnson*, with an introduction by John T. Morse, Jr. (Boston, 1911), 1: 127.

[39] *Harper's weekly*, January 25, 1862.

[40] William B. Sipes, *The Pennsylvania railroad: its origin, construction, condition and connections. Embracing historical, descriptive, and statistical notices of cities, towns, villages, stations, industries, and objects of interest on its various lines in Pennsylvania and New Jersey* (Philadelphia, 1875), 14.

[41] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies*, third series, 1: 889.

[42] *New York Semi-Weekly Tribune*, February 21, 1862.

[43] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies*, third series, 2: 838.

time went into operation May 3, 1862[44] and remained in force for the remainder of the war.[45] The convention also recommended that railroads whose expenses were increased by reason of being in or near the seat of the war should receive additional compensation.[46] This idea was carried out in the case of the Baltimore and Ohio, the Baltimore and Washington and some roads in Missouri, which were exempted from the operation of the reduced tariff.[47]

Another point of contact between the railroads and the government was in the case of the draft as it affected railroad employees. The Pennsylvania railroad complained that the draft in 1865 added an indiscriminate drain upon its forces and stated that "for a time it was impossible to procure even raw recruits in sufficient numbers."[48] The question whether all railroad employees should be exempted really presented a complex situation. In the present war, with the railroads under government operation and when their continued and efficient management is absolutely essential to the conduct of the war and the welfare of the country, there is no question about the right of the government to exempt railroad employees. In the civil war, however, the government was exercising little control over the roads. Some of them, for example the Michigan Central, were doing practically nothing in the way of government transportation, and, in the case of the others, the work done for the government, while it was important to the government, was purely incidental so far as the railroads were concerned.

When the draft was ordered in 1862, Stanton was besieged with telegrams from various railroad presidents asserting the importance of the railroads to the conduct of the war and asking that all their employees be exempted. Stanton, in reply to such a telegram from Scott, who had assumed the management of the Pennsylvania railroad, thought that some exception might be made, but considered that any order in regard to the railroads "ought to be limited to actual necessity or it may provoke hos-

[44] *Ibid.*, third series, 2: 839-841.

[45] *Ibid.*, third series, 5: 526.

[46] *Ibid.*, third series, 2: 838.

[47] *Ibid.*, third series, 2: 794.

[48] *Eighteenth annual report of the board of directors of the Pennsylvania railroad to the stockholders* (Philadelphia, 1865), 11.

tility in the public mind."[49] He also asked Scott for suggestions as to the form of the order.[50] Scott in reply proposed the exemption of all employees who had been in the service of a railroad three months previous to the last call of the president for troops, provided that such employees should enroll themselves under the military rules of the government and drill at least once a week. They would also be subject to special call in case of emergency.[51] Stanton, however, had already made up his mind that none but locomotive engineers in actual employment at the time of the order should be exempted,[52] and this was the plan finally adopted.[53]

At the time of the second draft in 1865, Scott made an interesting proposal to the government. He asked to "have the privilege of furnishing substitutes at Philadelphia, Pittsburg, or Harrisburg who when accepted shall release parties we may designate no matter in what district enrolled." As recompense for this privilege the substitutes were to be furnished for three years service although the draft was for one year.[54] This proposal was approved by the secretary of war,[55] but there is no evidence in the reports of the railroad company that any money was spent on substitutes.

The railroads shared the general burden of war taxation. The act of July 1, 1862, subjected them to a three per cent duty on gross receipts from passengers but gave them the right to add the tax to the rates of fare. A duty of three per cent was also imposed on all dividends or interest on bonds.[56] In most cases the roads were also subjected to state taxes. The Old Colony and Newport railroad complained that its town, state, and United States taxes for 1867 amounted to $105,465.91, nearly one-fourth of the net profits of the road.[57] The Pennsylvania railroad paid in the years 1863 to 1865 inclusive $763,816.19 as United States

[49] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* third series, 2: 310.

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] *Ibid.*, third series, 2: 322.

[52] *Ibid.*, third series, 2: 294.

[53] *Ibid.*, third series, 2: 322.

[54] *Ibid.*, third series, 4: 1049.

[55] *Ibid.*

[56] *United States statutes at large,* 12: 468.

[57] *Fifth annual report of the directors of the Old Colony and Newport railway company to the stockholders* (Boston, 1868), 7.

excise tax.[58] This was more than balanced, however, by the $3,390,848.45 earned from the transportation of troops.[59]

In addition to the relationship between the government and the railroads, the general effect of the war upon the railroads must be considered. The panic of 1857 had not only stopped railroad construction but it had also reduced the earnings of the roads to the minimum. In the fall of 1859, business conditions appear to have started to pick up. The Michigan Central, for example, reported that its earnings for May, 1860 showed an increase of $31,000 over the same month of the previous year. This increase was said to be due to the natural progress toward recovery in the western states.[60] It may have been an indication that trade was beginning to turn from its old course down the Mississippi river into the new channels which were later to absorb it.

The first effect of the war was a slight diminution in the earnings of the railroads, particularly those from passenger traffic. The smaller roads suffered most. The Boston and Worcester railroad found it necessary to reduce the number of its employees from five hundred and sixty-five to five hundred and nine. The time in the workshops was reduced from ten to nine hours a day with a corresponding reduction in the pay of the men.[61] The recovery, however, was rapid and by 1864 all the larger roads, in fact practically all the roads which had been wisely located in natural channels of trade, doubled or tripled their earnings. The total income of all the railroads of Massachusetts increased from nine million dollars in 1861[62] to eighteen millions in 1865.[63] The railroads in Pennsylvania totaled receipts in 1860 of twenty-one million which rose in 1865 to sixty-five million.[64] The roads in the west likewise benefited from the increase in trade. The Illinois Central earned $2,626,329 in 1861

[58] Compiled from the *Reports of the Pennsylvania railroad* for the years 1863 to 1865 inclusive. Later reports do not give these figures.

[59] *Ibid.*, 1861-1866.

[60] *Report of the directors of the Michigan Central railroad company to the stockholders* (Boston, 1860), 7.

[61] *Thirty-second annual report of the directors of the Boston and Worcester railroad corporation* (Boston, 1862), 4.

[62] *Returns of railroad corporations in Massachusetts*, 1861, p. 3.

[63] *Ibid.*, 1865, p. 313.

[64] *Reports of the several railroad and canal companies of Pennsylvania for the year 1865, communicated by the auditor general*, 459.

and $7,063,425 in 1865.[65] The Michigan Southern and Northern Indiana railroad was earning $2,167,280 in 1861 and $4,826,723 in 1865.[66]

The demand of Europe for western food products was undoubtedly a factor in the increased prosperity of many of the railroads. The following figures show the increase in this traffic in the case of the New York Central railroad.

Through tonnage eastward.[67]

	Vegetable food	Other agricultural products
1860	133,988	5,668
1861	223,179	15,054
1862	287,231	20,054
1863	241,036	35,541
1864	231,494	36,575

The aggregate figures for all the roads in New York state show the same variation with regard to vegetable food and a similar rapid increase in the tonnage of other agricultural products dropping off, however, in 1865.[68] There is no indication as to what the item "other agricultural products" included but it probably referred to grain since cattle, meat, and lumber were classified separately.

The Pennsylvania railroad apparently did not participate in this trade. Its through tonnage of agricultural products eastward dropped from 16,934,942 in 1861 to 149,981 in 1863, rising to 13,015,249 in 1865. At the same time, however, there was a very great increase in local tonnage.[69]

It may be said in general that the increase of revenues during the war period was not due to any one cause but rather to the general revival of business brought about by the war. The Providence and Worcester railroad is an example of a road which did little in the way of government transportation, and received none of the benefits of the increased European trade, but which, in 1864, announced that it was free from indebtedness,

[65] Henry V. Poor, *Manual of the railroads of the United States for 1868-1869* (New York, 1868), 353.

[66] *Eighth annual report of the president and directors of the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern railway company to the stockholders* (Cleveland, 1878), 50.

[67] *Annual reports of the engineer and surveyor of New York state*, 1860-1866.

[68] *Ibid.*

[69] *Reports of the Pennsylvania railroad company* for the years 1861 to 1865.

had added seventy-two freight cars and two engines, expended $20,000 on track and at the same time paid an eight per cent dividend.[70]

The war also conferred an additional though probably not an appreciated benefit on the railroads by checking, through the increased cost of labor and materials, any extensive new construction. The Boston and Worcester railroad reported that during the year 1864 the cost of labor had increased 28½ per cent, the cost of fuel 64 per cent, and the cost of materials for repairs by an average of 22 per cent.[71] The Pennsylvania railroad also reported "continued advances in wages and in the cost of materials."[72] The aggregate expenses of all the roads in the state of Pennsylvania jumped from eight million dollars in 1861 to forty-two million in 1865,[73] an increase which can be attributed only in part, either to the added business or to the depreciation of the greenbacks.

The natural result of this increased cost of labor and materials was to check railroad building, since the prosperity of the roads would otherwise have induced speculators to plan new roads in this section of the country. The mileage in Massachusetts in 1860 was 1,264 miles. In 1865, it was 1,297 miles, an increase of only thirty-three miles. The increase in mileage in New York was three hundred and twenty miles, most of which was added in 1865. About the same proportion of additional trackage was laid in the middle western states.[74]

The increased expense which the war imposed upon the railroads also led them to postpone repairs with the result that at the close of the war a heavy expenditure was necessary to put the roads in condition. The New York Central, in 1861, spent $1,632,673 in road maintenance. In 1865, this item had risen to $4,062,402.[75] The same large increase in the maintenance ac-

[70] *Boston Commercial Bulletin*, January 6, 1864.

[71] *Twenty-fifth annual report of the directors of the Boston and Worcester railroad corporation* (Boston, 1865), 4.

[72] *Eighteenth annual report of the Pennsylvania railroad*, 1865, p. 18.

[73] *Reports of the several railroad and canal companies of Pennsylvania for the year 1865, communicated by the auditor general*, 456.

[74] Poor, *Manual of the railroads of the United States for 1868-1869*, 20.

[75] *Annual report of the engineer and surveyor of New York state*, 1865, p. 161. Considerable advance was made during the decade along such lines as the use of steel rails, the improvement of the ventilation of passenger cars, and the introduction of

counts of the other roads justifies the conclusion that the roadways were somewhat neglected during the war.

The exercise of government control over the railroads except in case of extreme necessity was, according to the philosophy of the civil war period, an unwarranted interference with private rights. This idea is well brought out in a statement by J. P. Jackson, vice president and general superintendent of the New Jersey railroad and transportation company, in his report to the stockholders. "Many of our railroad companies," he said, "have required full fare for the transportation of troops and extended no free privileges. This is considered to be the true rule of business, for officers are only fiduciaries and should perform the services cheerfully and at liberal rates to the public generally, leaving the stockholders to appropriate their own property in donations and such charitable subscriptions as they may deem proper."[76]

In the present war, the government, by taking over the railroads, has eliminated the problems which were so important in the civil war, the questions of taxation, the drafting of railroad employees, and the regulation of rates for government transportation. It has, however, brought in new problems in connection with the effects the war is producing upon the roads. As in the civil war, the general rise in prices has caused a rise in the cost of labor, and new scales of wages for railroad employees have been established. Then, too, the scarcity of labor and materials is undoubtedly producing the same tendency to limit expenditures on maintenance and repairs. The great problem will come at the close of the present war if the attempt is made to restore the roads to their owners in the same condition in which they were delivered to the government.

Hermon King Murphey

Agricultural College
Fargo, North Dakota

Pullman sleeping coaches. These improvements, however, are not related to the war and cannot be considered as war products.

[76] *Report of the directors of the New Jersey railroad and transportation company* (Newark, 1861), 6.

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

The Origin of the Name of the Creek Indians

The name of the Creek Indians, unlike the names of most of the more important Indian tribes, is obviously of English, not of Indian origin. It is usually said that it was given them by the English "on account of the numerous streams in their country."[1] This common-sense explanation sounds suspiciously made-to-order; it is, in point of fact, only a rough approximation of the truth. An examination of late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century colonial records reveals a more precise origin for the term. Its etymology is, indeed, an epitome of the period of first contact between the eastern Muskogee and the English of Carolina.

From the beginnings of settlement in South Carolina the English were aware of the importance of the "Cussitaws" whom they knew only vaguely as a "powerfull Nation" seated somewhere inland beyond the Savannah river.[2] Although the proprietors in 1677 reserved to themselves a monopoly of the trade with the "Cussatoes" as well as with the Westo,[3] it was probably not until after the destruction of the latter (1680-1681) that continuous relations were developed with their more distant rivals. When that first crisis was past the Carolina trade expanded rapidly southwestward. As early as 1685 the Chatta-

[1] Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians north of Mexico* (Bureau of American ethnology, *Bulletin*, number 30), part 1, p. 362. This and similar assertions are probably based ultimately upon the statement by James Adair, in his *History of the American Indians* (London, 1775), 257, that the Creek country was so called "on account of the great number of Creeks, or small bays, rivulets and swamps, it abounds with." But Adair was not a Creek trader; and, moreover, his career among the southern Indians began more than a quarter century after the name had come into common use.

[2] South Carolina historical society, *Collections*, 5: 446 *passim*. The identification of "Chufytachyqj y^{t} fruitfule Provence where the Emperour resides," visited by Henry Woodward in 1670, with Kasihta and DeSoto's Cofitachiqui, assumed by Langdon Cheves and accepted by J. R. Swanton (Mississippi valley historical association, *Proceedings*, 5: 153), is not improbable.

[3] *Calendar of state papers, America and West Indies, 1677-1680*, 60.

hoochee river was crossed by the vanguard of the Carolinians under the explorer, Henry Woodward.[4] The center of the southern trade, however, long remained about the forks of the Altamaha. The Indians of that region, the "Cussetas and Kaweetas," became, in succession to the Westo and the temporarily dominant Savannahs, the central factor in the South Carolina Indian system. They were expressly mentioned, with the Cherokee and the Yuchi, in an act of 1691 laying an embargo on the trade with the distant Indians;[5] while in 1693 they were described by a committee of the commons house of assembly as "our friends," and measures were advised to present the threatened settlement among them of the remnant of the hostile Westo.[6] As "friends" of the English they were engaged, in the last decade of the century, in raids upon the Florida Indians, a fact which gave the authorities at St. Augustine frequent occasion for complaint, and which brought numerous Indian slaves to the Charles Town market.

Of the various expressions employed in the early English records to describe the inland Indians of the South Carolina-Florida frontier, such as "Cursitaws," "Cowataws and Cussetaws," "Ogamulgees," "Ochese"—names often applied loosely to the whole group, rather than specifically to certain towns or subdivisions of the eastern Muskogee—the last came to be the one in commonest use in the early years of the eighteenth century. Ocheese ("people") was in origin the Hitchiti term for their Muskhogean neighbors. Prior to the Yamasee war the chief towns of the Ocheese, Kawita, and Kasihta were located on the upper Ocmulgee river. As was frequently the case, the stream took the name of the folk, so that the Ocmulgee river above the approximate site of Macon, Georgia, was known to the English as "Ochese Creek."[7] Thus in January, 1702, Governor James Moore counselled the assembly to "think of some way to confirm the Cussatoes w^{ch} live on Ocha-sa Creek & the Savannos in the Place they now live in, and to our friendship

[4] William E. Dunn, *Spanish and French rivalry in the gulf region, 1678-1702* (*University of Texas bulletin*, number 1705), 71.

[5] Cooper,, *Statutes at large of South Carolina*, 2: 66.

[6] Commons house journals, January 13-14, 1693 (manuscript at Columbia, South Carolina).

[7] As shown on various eighteenth century maps, including Mitchell's map of North America of 1755.

they being the only People by whom we may expect Advice of an Inland Invasion."[8] Such was the importance of this locality in the South Carolina Indian system, not only as the center of the trade with the Indians between the Savannah and the Chattahoochee rivers, but also as a stage on the path to the Talapoosa, Alibamu, Abihka, and Chickasaw of the Louisiana frontier, and as the key to the defense of the southern border of the province, that Ochese creek was, to Carolinians at that epoch, the "Creek" *par excellence*. For example, the Indian commissioners set down in their journal in 1713 the proposal of the Yamasee that "the Cheehaws [Chiaha] who were formerly belonging to the Yamassees and now settled at the Creek might return."[9] In consequence the term "Ochese Creek Indians" often became, by abbreviation, often simply *Creeks*. An account of the Indians in South Carolina sent to the board of trade by Robert Johnson in 1720, which was, however, based on the journals of the Indian agents in the decade before the Yamasee war, gave the numbers and the location of "the Ochesees or Creeks."[10] The expressions were thus at first synonymous; and for a time the name Creek was strictly confined to the easternmost Muskogee. Their western kinsfolk and allies were called specifically "Alabamas," "Talapoosas," "Abihkas." When, in 1707, an elaborate intrigue was set in motion by the provincial government to convert the Choctaw and Yazoo from the French to the English alliance, the Indian agent was warned by the assembly that the league would not be lasting unless formed "with the consent of the Creek and Talabushees Indians."[11] Again, when the assembly was planning, in 1709, to collect a force of Indians to protect the settlements in an expected emergency, provision was made for raising 150 Indians "among the Severall Towns of the Creek Indians proportionably," and in addition "50 from the Talibouses and Alabamas."[12] Soon, however, the western Muskogee, with whom the English were in close alliance against the French and their allies in the period

[8] Commons house journals, January 14, 1702.

[9] Indian commissioners' journal, March 25, 1713 (manuscript at Columbia, South Carolina).

[10] Public record office, Board of trade papers, Proprieties, 10, Q: 201 (transcript at Columbia, South Carolina).

[11] Commons house journal, November 22, 1707.

[12] *Ibid.*, April 23, 1709.

of Queen Anne's war, came to be included in the popular designation of Creeks. Apparently the complaint of Captain Musgrove in 1710 "that the Creek Indians owe him" [for ammunition] "since they went to war against the Choctaw Indians" was directed against the western group.[13] As early as 1712 a distinction in term was made between the western and eastern Creeks, which became thereafter the stereotyped English usage, when the Indian commissioners instructed their agent to adjust affairs among "the upper and lower Creeks."[14]

From a survey of contemporary allusions it is apparent that the name Creek was first applied by the English to those members of the Muskhogean group with whom they were first in contact, the Indians who lived on or near the upper Ocmulgee, i. e., "Ochese on Creek;" that it was derived from the expression Ochese Creek Indians; and that as the familiarity of the Carolinians with the western members of the great southern confederacy increased, the popular name was extended to them, losing in the process its original specific connotation.

Verner W. Crane

A Letter from New Madrid, 1789

The letter from New Madrid of April 14, 1789, is here reprinted from the text as it appears in the *Virginia Gazette* and *Weekly Advertiser* of August 27, 1789. In Houck's *History of Missouri*, 2:112-115, extracts are printed from a joint letter of Major McCully, Colonel Shreve, Colonel Christopher Hays, Captain Light, Captain Taylor, John Dodge, David Rankin, John Ward, John Stewart, James Rhea, Captain Hewling and others, addressed to Dr. John Morgan of Philadelphia, dated New Madrid, April 14, 1789. Houck says this was published in Philadelphia, but gives no reference; he thinks that it was this letter which led Madison to write to Washington that it "contained the most authentic and precise evidence of the Spanish project that has come to my knowledge." From the evidence it appears, however, that it was the circular of Morgan, issued in the fall of 1788, calling for settlers, which was the subject of Madison's statement to Washington. The circular is printed in full in Hunt's *Madison*, 5:331, in connection with the letter to

[13] Indian commissioners' journal, October 28, 1710.

[14] *Ibid.*, July 9, 1712.

Washington on March 26, 1789. The extracts from the New Madrid letter as printed by Houck do not agree in all respects with the corresponding passages in the letter printed in the *Virginia Gazette*. For this reason, and also because there are important parts not printed at all by Houck, it seems desirable to reprint the text in full from the *Virginia Gazette*. For some of the numerous references to George Morgan see "Life of George Morgan" in the Washington (Pa.) *Observer*, May 21, 1904, by Julia Morgan Harding; Alvord's *Kaskaskia records*, 1778-1790, p. 3; *Calendar of Virginia state papers*, v. 4, p. 554, 555; J. H. Baussman's *History of Beaver county, Pa.*, v. 1, p. 67, 67, with portrait; Houck's *History of Missouri*, v. 2, p. 109 ff.; C. E. Carter's *Great Britain in the Illinois country*, 1763-1774, index. There is a description of Morganza, the home of Morgan, in Thwaites' edition of Cuming's *Tour to the west*, p. 240.

E. G. Swem

Pittsburgh, August 1.

To Messrs. Bedford and Turnbull, Pittsburg.

New-Madrid, April 14, 1789.

Gentlemen,

The inclemency of the season, and the precautions necessary for the advantage and security of our party and enterprize, rendered our voyage down the Ohio long, though not a disagreeable one. We have now been in the Mississippi two months, most of which time has been taken up in visiting the lands from Cape St. Comme, on the north, to this place on the south, and westward to the river St. Francois, the general course of which is parallel with the Mississippi, and from twenty to thirty miles distance.

Colonel Morgan, with 19 others, undertook to reconnoitre the lands above, or north of the Ohio; this gave him the earliest possible opportunity of producing his credentials to Don Manuel Peres, governor of the Illinois, who treated him and those who accompanied him with the greatest possible politeness; and their arrival, after their business was known, created a general joy throughout the country, among all ranks of its inhabitants. Even the neighboring Indians have expressed the greatest pleasure on our arrival, and intentions of settlement.

There is not a single nation or tribe of indians who claims or pretend to claim, a foot of land granted to Colonel Morgan. This is a grand matter in favour of our settlement.

The governor very cheerfully supplied our party with every necessary demanded by Colonel Morgan, and particularly with horses and guides

to reconnoitre all the lands to the western limits, and from north to south, in the interior country.

In an undertaking of this nature, it is not to be doubted, but different opinions have prevailed amongst us in regard to the most advantageous situation where was best to establish the first settlement of farmers and planters. A considerable number of reputable French families on the American side of the Illinois, who propose to join us, wished to influence our judgments in favour of a very beautiful situation and country about twelve leagues above the Ohio. A number of American farmers, deputed from Post St. Vincents, and some others of our party, were delighted with the country opposite the Ohio, one league back from the river, to which there is access by a rivulet, which empties itself into the Mississippi about two and a half, or three miles above the Ohio. Some declared for a situation and very fine country, to which there is a good landing at the highest floods and about nine miles below the Ohio; but after maturely considering every circumstance, and examining the country in this neighbourhood fully, we have united in the resolution to establish our new city, from whence this letter is dated, about twelve leagues below the Ohio, at a place formerly called Lance La Graise, or the Greasy Bend, below the mouth of a river, marked in Captain Hutchin's map Cheyousea or Sound river.

Here the banks of the Mississippi, for a considerable length, are high, dry, and pleasant, and the soil westward to the river St. Francois, is of the most desirable quality for Indian corn, tobacco, flax, cotton, hemp, and indigo, though thought by some too rich for wheat; insomuch, that we verily believe that there is not an acre of it uncultivable, or even indifferent land, within a thousand square miles.

The country rises gradually from the Mississippi into fine, dry, pleasant and healthful grounds, superior, we believe, in beauty and in quality, to every other part of America.

The limits of our new city of Madrid are to extend four miles south down the river, and two miles west from it, so as to cross a beautiful deep lake, of the purest spring water, 100 yards wide, and several leagues in length north and south, and emptying itself by a constant narrow stream through the center of the city. The banks of this lake, which is called St. Ann's, are high, dry and pleasant: The water deep, clear, and sweet, the bottom a clean sand, free from wood, shrubs, or other vegetables, and well stored with fish.

On each side of this delightful lake, streets are to be laid out 100 feet wide, and a road to be continued round it of the same breadth, and the trees are directed to be preserved for ever, for the health and pleasure of its citizens.

A street 120 feet wide on the banks of the Mississippi is laid out, and the trees are directed to be preserved for the same purpose.

Twelve acres in a central part of the city are to be served in the like manner, and be ornamented, improved, and regulated by the magistracy of the city for public walks, and forty lots of half an acre each, are appropriated to such public use as the citizens shall recommend, or the chief-magistrate direct; and one lot of twelve acres is to be reserved for the king's use. One city lot of half an acre, and one lot of five acres, to be a very free gift to each of the 600 first settlers.

Our surveyors are now engaged in laying out the city and outlots upon this extensive and approved plan, and in surveying the country into farms of 320 acres each, previous to individuals making any choice or settlement.

These farms, and the conditions of settlement being also upon a plan universally satisfactory, will prevent the endless law-suits which different modes in other countries have established, and entailed upon the posterity of the first settlers.

We have built cabins, and a magazine for provisions, &c. and are proceeding to make gardens, and to plough and plant 100 acres of the finest prairies land in the world with Indian corn, some hemp, flax, cotton, tobacco, and potatoes.

The timber here differ in some instances from what you have in the middle states of America; yet we have white oaks of an extraordinary great size, tall and straight; also black oaks, mulbury, ash, poplar, parsimons, crab apple in abundance, and larger than ever we saw before, hickory, walnut, locust, and sassafras trees of an extraordinary length and straightness, are common of 24 inches diameter.

The underwood is principally cane and spice. — The timber unknown to you are cypress, pacan, coffee, cucumber, and some others. The cypress grows on the low land along the river, and is equal in quality to white ceader.

We have a fine tract of this in our neighbourhood, which Colonel Morgan has directed to be surveyed into lots of a suitable size, to accommodate every farm.

We are pleased with the climate, and have reason to flatter ourselves that we have at last found a country equal to our most sanguine wishes.

Several principal French gentlemen at St. Gennieve has offered to conduct Colonel Morgan, or any person he pleases to send, to as fine iron and lead mines as any in America, within a short day's journey of the Mississippi, and within the bounds of his territory.

It is intended to preserve these for some person or persons of sufficient capital and knowledge to undertake to work them.

Salt springs are said to be dispersed through all the country; as we have this information from the best authority we believe it, but have not visited any.

The banks of the Mississippi for many leagues in extent, commencing 20 odd miles above the Ohio, are a continued chain of limestone; but we have not yet found any in this neighbourhood.

We would mention many other particulars which would be pleasing to our friends, but this would require more time to write a copy, than we can spare from our other necessary employments. We however, add, that a thousand farms are directed to be surveyed, which will soon be executed, for the immediate choice and settlement of all families who shall come here next fall, and that the months of September, October, November, December, and January, are the most proper to arrive here, as the farmers can begin to plough in February, and continue that work until Christmas.

After the surveys are compleated, Colonel Morgan and Major M'Cully will proceed to New York, via New-Orleans and Cuba; and Colonel Shreeve, Captain Light and Captain Taylor, with all others who conclude to return immediately for their families, will ascend the Ohio, in time to leave Fort Pitt again for this place in October.

Captain Huling undertakes the direction of a number of single men to plant one hundred acres of Indian corn, some tobacco, cotton, flax and hemp. Colonel Morgan has supplied him with horses and ploughs, &c. He will be able to build a good house and mill against his father and brothers arrival here next fall.

As not a single person of our whole party, consisting of seventy men, has been sick an hour, nor met with any accident, but on the contrary all enjoy perfect health, and are in high spirits on the discovery of this happy clime and country, we think it needless to mention the name of any one in particular.

We are, Sirs,

Your most obedient servants,

(Signed) David Rankin,
George M'Cully, John Ward,
John Dodge, John Stewart,
Peter Light, James Rhea.

A true copy,

Samuel Sellman, jun.

President Wilson's foreign policy: messages, addresses, papers. Edited with introduction and notes by James Brown Scott. (New York: Oxford university press, 1918. 429 p.)

Very seldom, probably never, has there been granted to a man power to speak so frequently and so pregnantly to an expectant world as has been granted to the president of the United States during the last few years. It is, therefore, a very important service that Mr. Scott has performed in collecting in one volume — handsomely printed in large type — the words that have been heard around the world.

It is also gratifying that such an authority on international law as is Mr. Scott, after editing this long series of messages and addresses containing Mr. Wilson's foreign policy — frequently so severely criticized by his political opponents — can write: "And yet, if we analyze President Wilson's messages and addresses on foreign policy . . . we find that, whether delivered before the war of 1914, during the period of American neutrality, or after the outbreak of the war between Germany and the United States, when President Wilson was speaking as the chief executive of a belligerent country, they are but the varying expressions of a single, definite, conscious purpose, namely, the strengthening of constitutional government where it existed, leavened with democracy, and the introduction of constitutional government where it did not exist, of a democratic nature or tendency." In the reviewer's opinion, after rereading as a whole the series of papers, this judgment of Mr. Scott's will be confirmed by future historians.

President Wilson has taught the world the meaning of democracy in speech after speech. He has expressed his meaning in various ways, he has exhibited one phase of democracy at one time, another phase at another, but on all occasions the descriptions ring true to the principles most deep seated in his thought.

He believes that the heart of man can be trusted in the long run to do right, when the power of the state is in the control of the people. Towards this end he always labors and even when he believes the peeople are being wrongly led, still he would leave it to them to work out their own salvation without external interference. Of the Mexican people struggling with factional revolutions, he said: "We are glad to call ourselves the friends of Mexico, and we shall, I hope, have many an oc-

casion in happier times as well as in these days of trouble and confusion, to show that our friendship is genuine and disinterested, capable of sacrifice and very generous manifestation. The peace, prosperity, and contentment of Mexico mean more, much more, to us than merely an enlarged field for our commerce and enterprise. They mean an enlargement of the field of self-government and the realization of the hopes and rights of a nation with whose best aspirations, so long suppressed and disappointed, we deeply sympathize. We shall yet prove to the Mexican people that we know how to serve them without first thinking how we shall serve ourselves."

In this address on Mexican affairs, the first printed in the volume, the president lays down the principles of democracy as they should be applied to international relations. Justice and right should alone be considered. The same principles that govern the relations of citizens in a civilized state are equally applicable between states.

Mr. Scott has written a brief but satisfactory introduction to the volume and informatory notes before the more important addresses.

C. W. A.

Latest light on Abraham Lincoln and wartime memories including many heretofore unpublished incidents and historical facts concerning his ancestry, boyhood, family, religion, public life, trials and triumphs. By Erwin Chapman. (New York: Fleming H. Revell company, 1918. 570 p. $4.00 net)

This bulky volume is a labor of love which the author lays upon the altar of his devotion to the great emancipator. Its ambitious title lures the student of Lincoln to its pages with a keen zest for intellectual nourishment; he is therefore all the more disappointed to confront a situation which for half a century in the making must have wrung bitter tears from the muse of history. We are told that the author has been unusually careful to establish beyond question the truth of every statement and the deduction made therefrom resulting in "a Lincoln in whose lineage and birth, and personal experience and religious belief and experience we have every reason to be proud" (p. 5). Yet we find no critical analysis, no sifting of evidence; instead a tendency to rely on previous Lincoln commentators who have preceded the author in reaching an approved interpretation. Throughout the work an ill-concealed propaganda purpose, to create a Lincoln of whose absolute perfection the nation may proudly boast, peers out at the reader. Lincoln thereby becomes the epitome of all the ideals which Mr. Chapman himself has striven to attain — a believer in orthodox religion, a valiant leader in reform movements, and a temperance crusader.

After zealous defiance of those who would challenge the legitimacy of

Nancy Hanks, the book proclaims "Abraham Lincoln was also favored by prenatal preparation for his great earthly mission" (p. 28), proof of which is submitted mainly in references to illustrations of prenatal influence in bible history. One wonders where the author secured his evidence of the ideal environment in which Nancy Hanks moved during the period of her expectancy. "No where in history can there be found the story of a human life which more clearly and effectively illustrates the potency of prenatal influence than does that of Abraham Lincoln and his mother. There never has been, nor will there ever be, another Abraham Lincoln" (p. 31). Are these the calm conclusions of a judicious-minded historian?

Ignoring all evidence of Lincoln's religious doubts, he portrays a consistent devotee of orthodox religion, proclaiming, often upon clearly insufficient evidence, Lincoln's undoubted belief in the deity of Christ, in the doctrine of the atonement, and in all the miracles of the new testament. Colonel Jaques' testimony in 1897 to his conversion of Lincoln nearly fifty years before is quoted with uncritical comment. "There is every reason for giving this remarkable story unquestioning credence" (p. 397). The proslavery attitude of the church is indicated as the only insuperable obstacle to Lincoln's application for chuch membership. The story that Lincoln after the disaster of Bull Run travelled in disguise to the home of Henry Ward Beecher to seek comfort in the prayers of that great divine is defended on the general evidence of Lincoln's faith in prayer and of his personal regard for Beecher. So picking and culling, the octogenarian student and reminiscencer with Calvinistic fortitude builds up his picture of the predestined saviour of the union and perfect model for mankind. The volume, sadly lacking in synthesis, is not unlike the patch-work quilt which according to the story related by the author was miraculously transported in answer to Lincoln's prayer from a Connecticut mother's arms to the cot of her wounded son in North Carolina (pp. 544-548). So uncritical is the method of the author and the spirit of the volume that the reader involuntarily finds himself inclined to challenge even such conclusions as can stand the test of historical criticism.

ARTHUR C. COLE

Report of the librarian of congress and report of the superintendent of the library building and grounds. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917. (Washington: Government printing office, 1917. 223 p. $.40)

Librarian Putnam's latest report is restricted by "the economic situation" to the bare record of the library's operations "with only such explanations and comments as are needed to indicate their significance."

The single exception relates to manuscript accessions, these "being largely the result of gift." The place of honor among these papers is accorded those pertaining to the American revolution, prepared by Charles Thompson, secretary of the continental congress, supplementing Thompson's "Journals," which in 1903 found place in the state department library. After ten years' negotiations these valuable personal papers have finally found place in our great governmental repository. They include notes on debates, and letters from Franklin, Dickinson, Jay, Jefferson, Robert and Governeur Morris, Madison, and Monroe.

The librarian regretfully announces that the publication of the *Journals of the continental congress*, 23 volumes of which have appeared, was suspended in 1914. As the record of the foundation of the American state, and as an explanation of our subsequent governmental development, all students of history will agree with Mr. Hunt, chief of the manuscript division, that "there can be no doubt as to the value of this publication."

The retirement of Chief Sonneck of the music division is deplored, for Mr. Sonneck's fifteen years of constructive service have resulted in a collection of 740,000 musical compositions, 35,000 contributions to the literature of music, and 20,000 items of musical instruction, all bearing upon music in America.

The call to military service and the demands of new bureaus and commissions have interfered with the workings of the library. The library met the needs of the bureau of citizenship of the state department by loaning the services of Mr. Hunt.

Without entering into details of the finances of the library, we may gather from them several interesting items.

In forty-six years, the total of entries in the copyright office has been 3,043,835. During the last fiscal year, 18,177 volumes have been transferred to the library from the copyright office; 5,081 books have been deposited in governmental libraries in the District; and 57,215 articles have been returned to copyright claimants, including 15,464 books, 398 photographs, 16,963 prints, 11,326 periodicals, 3,415 musical compositions, and 9,649 films.

The library of congress at the close of the fiscal year included: books, 2,537,922, a year's gain of 85,948; maps and charts (pieces), 158,480, a year's gain of 4,280; music (volumes and pieces), 795,749, a year's gain of 25,501; prints (pieces), 397,945, a year's gain of 5,040.

Of the accessions of books and pamphlets during the past year, 17,348 were by purchase, 12,100 were by gift. The rest were chiefly donated by state and local governments, by copyright and by transfer from

government libraries, home and foreign. The war necessarily reduced the accessions from abroad from 14,850 to 9,619.

To facilitate the continued receipt of German and Austrian material, Mr. Koch, chief of the order division, spent several months abroad. His fortunate presence in London resulted in the gift of a large and valuable collection of "Whistleriana" by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Pennell, the artist's biographers. The collection, contained in fourteen cases, includes many of Whistler's drawings and paintings, hundreds of letters to and from distinguished people, and books on the arts in which Whistler was preëminent. Several valuable specimens of fifteenth century printing were also acquired.

Recent acquisitions have added materially to the library's collection of foreign law material, material in which most of our state libraries are weak.

The report includes an article by Julean Arnold, American commercial attaché to China and Japan, with the suggestive title, "Get the map habit," a plea for the better understanding of the countries whose trade we solicit.

The indebtedness of the large libraries of the country to the library of congress for copies of the printed catalog cards of our great national library, made accessible by purchase soon after Mr. Putnam entered upon his duties as librarian, cannot better be measured than by the fact that the number of subscribers for these cards is 2,559, an increase of 189 since 1916. The titles of cards represented in stock number about 735,000.

The legislative reference of the library is fast growing. In 1915, when the service was new, it registered 269 inquiries; in 1916, 756; in 1917, 1,280. Of the 1,280, 471 relate to law; 809 relate to economics, statistics, and history. The inquiries came mainly from congressmen, and followed closely the prevailing subjects of general interest before congress, most of them covering a wide range of questions growing out of the war. It may reasonably be anticipated that this relatively new service will be greatly extended, and that the libraries and historical associations of the country will in the near future find it the great central source of information on all questions of public interest.

JOHNSON BRIGHAM

Handbook of manuscripts in the library of congress. (Washington: Government printing office, 1918. 750 p. $.65)

The students and writers of American history will be glad to make the acquaintance of this detailed index of the richest manuscript collection in this country. The handbook is practically a subject catalog of the collections arranged alphabetically and designed "to present the

whole resources of the division in a comprehensive way." Each collection is entered under a chosen title, followed by a brief account of its size and origin, a list of dates represented, and an itemized description of the contents. Under headings from which a collection might be sought, cross references are given to the particular title that has been chosen. The main body of the catalog is preceded by a list of the larger collections, grouped under twenty-five general headings, such as military, literary, political, and others, with a few more specific headings as revolution, Indians, and Washington City. An elaborate index of two hundred and four pages gives further details to the student.

ETHEL VIRTUE

The American Indian. An introduction to the anthropology of the new world. By Clark Wissler, curator of anthropology, American museum of natural history, New York City. (New York: Douglas C. McMurtrie, 1917. 434 p. $2.50)

This book is everything that one should expect from such an authority. Free from technicalities, yet thoroughly scientific, it fills a place heretofore vacant in the study of American anthropology, if we except the work of Brinton in 1891, or that of Latham more than a half century ago.

Nor may either of these be properly mentioned in the same field, but for the fact that they endeavor to give, as does Mr. Wissler's book, a classification according to linguistics of both the North and South American continents. As an attempt to cover the whole range of anthropological science, as it relates to the Americas, the book is an eminent success. Nearly every phase of the subject here gathered into one volume has been touched upon before by equally distinguished writers, as the author shows in his chapter references; and monographs in one form or another have been available; but here for the first time, and in an orderly sequence according to his own fearless method, is a book which cannot fail to command the attention of all students of American Indian life.

The volume is composed of twenty-one chapters of some length. The first of these properly begins with a description of the food areas of the new world. As the author contends, this is easily of prime importance. It gives basis for an excellent thesis, as it is obvious that the fundamental security for man's very existence is the amount and kind of sustenance he may acquire within certain defined limits. Mr. Wissler distinctly draws the line between his study of the Indian as a man and his broader field of research, and in this his book is decidedly an anthropological and not an ethnological treatise. He reviews in the chapters which follow: the textile arts, the ceramic arts, decorative and textile designs, architecture, work in stone and metals, industries, mythology,

social groupings, rituals, culture, and finally linguistic and somatic classifications.

We can hardly term his methods new or in any way improvements on what has already been shown by Powell or Boas. In the chapter touching on culture centers or culture elements, he has, however, clearly defined the subject; and, where he seems to propound no new ideas in linguistics, he includes a most excellent list of stocks, a noteworthy series of tables, and a most comprehensive bibliography. He confesses, as indeed he must, his inability to throw any new light on what has already been done in no very trustworthy manner on the form of South American classification. Whether any affinity can be proved between the northern and southern continents is yet beyond the power of American anthropologists to determine, and Mr. Wissler, always careful and invariably safe in his statements, makes no claim toward offering new data in a yet unexplored and largely experimental field.

In chapter 19, "correlation of classifications," the author has given the best summary of the subject which has yet come under the reviewer's notice. He begins first with the historic and prehistoric culture classifications, and with the aid of a map clearly brings to the reader the relation of the one to the other. He believes there is no co-relation to be found in the culture and language. This is readily seen, for example, in the case of the Eskimo, where culture, language, and somatic type are shown to be distinct from other parts of the continent. He finds, also, with Mooney, that the immigration factor must enter largely into consideration (as for instance the Siouan tribes as found in the east) and that the influence of environment, i. e. the flora and fauna of a locality, must be taken largely into account. As a concrete account of this whole subject, this chapter stands preëminent among many which for a long time must be considered definitive.

A very careful and conservative chapter is the last, "New world origins." Nothing actually new is offered, as indeed nothing can be, but as an illuminating resumé of our present knowledge, by one who possesses all available information, it offers fascinating reading. Whether the new world was peopled from China or the Pacific islands is yet a problem. No evidence has come to hand that would identify a single new world language with an old world stock; nor can we properly show blood affinities with the Mongoloid peoples of Asia; yet, as the author sums up, we can scarcely forego the regret that the American Indians did not start on their career many thousands of years earlier than their brethren of the east.

There is an excellent bibliography appended to the volume; and there are chapter references under author headings which, by a series of

superior numbers through the text, are made readily available; nor must we overlook a thorough and carefully prepared index. The page maps throughout are good, as are the numerous and well selected illustrations. It is only the mechanical make up of the volume that could be adversely criticized; as there is, for example, no statement on the title page that the work is by Dr. Wissler, and, as in the copy before us, the large folding maps are not properly inserted.

W. H. Miner

Ka-Mi-Akin. The last hero of the Yakimas. By A. J. Splawn. (Portland, Oregon: Mrs. A. J. Splawn. 1917. 436 p. $2.00)

Within the last ten or fifteen years there have come from the west various fugitive items which would not rank well according to the American historical association methods, but in which there is unquestionably a wealth of local detail and western color, much of which it would be difficult to find elsewhere since it is not included in more accurate and methodically arranged historical works.

Ka-Mi-Akin. The last hero of the Yakimas is published by the author's widow, partly as a memorial and partly because the volume is of genuine interest. It appeals somewhat to readers of the central west because the writer was born in Holt county, Missouri, in 1845.

Mr. Splawn was a typical pioneer and frontiersman. He crossed the plains with the family, settled in Linn county, Oregon, in 1851, from thence migrated to Washington, and spent practically all his life after the age of fifteen in Yakima county, where he was actively engaged in the cattle business for thirty-five years. He helped organize the first meat packing plant on the west coast, was president of the Live Stock association, and went to the Washington state legislature in 1902 as senator.

In 1908 he ran for governor on the democratic ticket, leading a forlorn hope for his party. Later he was the first mayor of North Yakima under the commission form of government. Always an upright and fearless man and invariably at the head of all advanced projects in the northwest, he was known throughout that country not only by the white population but by the Indians of Washington, Oregon, and Montana, as a friend, advocate, and adviser.

His book, like that written by Governor George E. Cole, and one or two others, is a product of the time and the place. It is primarily the life of the Yakima chief, Ka-Mi-Akin, and has to deal with the Indian raids, outbreaks, wars, and expeditions in the valley of the Columbia and in the Willamette country.

There is an excellent account of McClelland's expedition in 1853; of the establishment of Fort Simcoe in 1856 and its attendant Indian troubles; of the cowboy in 1861, at which period he was at the zenith of

his fame; of the founding of Ellensburg in 1870. Altogether the fifty-five comparatively short chapters are of real interest, though there is no great amount of literary charm. Practically the whole book is devoted in one way or another to Indian affairs, but there is some genealogy and local history of the northwest, and one particularly well written chapter on Indian folklore.

The numerous illustrations, in every way appropriate to the text, are for the most part full page half tones. Except for the somewhat amateurish style in the way of book-making, there is little if any adverse criticism to offer. Almost any book of this kind ought to be received in the proper spirit and looked upon as a contribution to a certain phase of the history of our country, from which, as we have stated above, much may be gleaned.

W. H. Miner

Western influence on political parties to 1825. An essay in historical interpretation. By Homer C. Hockett, professor of American history, Ohio state university. [Ohio state university bulletin, 22: number 3, Contributions in history and political science, number 4] (Columbus: Ohio state university, 1917. 157 p. $1.00)

This monograph was begun "in a search for the key to the political history of Monroe's presidency." This key Mr. Hockett seems to find in the growth of the west, which by 1824 had become so keenly conscious of its peculiar economic interests and voting strength that it laid claim, in the candidacies of Clay and Jackson, to the highest office in the land and to a determining influence in shaping national policies. "Only on the surface was the campaign of 1824 a personal contest among men holding 'common republican principles.' . . . That portion of the West which placed economic interests first followed Clay into the coalition with Adams which formed the National Republican party." To that portion of the west which placed democratic government first, the circumstances under which the national republican party was born gave great offense, and enabled the friends of Jackson to promote his cause in the name of popular rule. To the support of this element were gradually drawn the southern planters who, in an earlier period, had been allied with the northeast. Although feeling no enthusiasm for popular government, these aristocrats were opposed to the economic policy of the national republicans, and saw in Adams' inaugural address and first message that the south had nothing to expect from that party. This was the basis of the temporary union of the southern planters and Jackson's western following in common opposition to the party in power.

Not only was the economic development of the west the most important factor in the re-formation of parties between 1815 and 1825, but, in the

period immediately preceding, it had played an equally important part in the disappearance of the federalist party. Federalism had indeed been carried westward by migrating New Englanders, but it was unable long to withstand the democratic tendencies of the frontier, and in time disappeared in the rapidly rising republicanism, the process proceeding more rapidly in connection with national politics than in state and local campaigns. Detailed illustrations of this process of party amalgamation are drawn from the political development of western New York and Pennsylvania. This fusion was undoubtedly hastened also by the narrow opposition of eastern federalists to the admission of Tennessee and Ohio.

In time, however, a tendency appeared for the northeast to forget its earlier antipathy to the Ohio valley and for the northwest to forget its resentment of eastern opposition to western development. This, with the rapidly growing western consciousness of a certain community of interests with the old northeast, prepared the way for the political alliance of 1824 between the two sections. This alliance was based chiefly upon the sense of common, or, of at least, complementary interests in the maintenance of a protective tariff and internal improvements, and was hastened and facilitated by common opposition to the extension of slavery at the time of the admission of Missouri.

In these conclusions the well-read student of American history will perhaps not detect much if anything that is essentially new, but he will find them supported by an interesting array of corroborative testimony, drawn very extensively from contemporary local sources. The evidence imparts freshness and interest to this intensive study in politico-economic history.

As an introduction to his main thesis which has been summarized above, Mr. Hockett endeavors to show, in unnecessarily long preliminary sections, that "the first party divisions on a continental scale" were based upon the politico-economic antagonism between the frontier and the coast, which appeared in the middle of the eighteenth century and continued throughout the revolutionary and critical periods. This perhaps is the least original and least valuable part of the essay.

As a whole, the monograph fully realizes the author's hope that the essay might prove to be "sufficiently successful to warrant a continuation of this type of study for the period since 1825." The value of this scholarly work is enhanced by a large number of illuminating footnotes and by an extensive bibliography, from which, however, the page references to articles and essays in periodicals, annuals, and university studies have unfortunately been systematically omitted.

P. Orman Ray

The commonwealth of Pennsylvania. By Thomas Kilby Smith, of the Philadelphia bar. (New York: Encyclopedia press, 1917. 318 p. $1.00)

The purpose of this little volume is thus set forth in the preface: "The object of the series of hand books of which this is the pioneer is to give in compact form the salient facts relating to the history, development, and present social, economic, and political status of the different States of the Union."

The author first presents in a twelve page chapter a general survey of the physical features, counties, and population. Then follow three chapters on the history of Pennsylvania from its first settlement to 1915. These chapters are poorly proportioned as follows: "History prior to the revolution," 34 pages; "The revolutionary period," 14 pages; "History from the admission to the union," 24 pages. This very brief survey of the history under the constitution is partly atoned for by the fact that much material on different phases of the history is presented under other headings in following chapters. The author then treats successively the following subjects: government; military affairs; manners and customs; state finance; resources; religion, giving sketches and statistics of the various denominations; conditions affecting women and children; education and the professions; literature, art, and science; social systems; care of criminals. Bibliographical references conclude each chapter, and an index concludes the volume. It thus appears that this volume is concerned more with other matters than with ordinary history, though this makes it none the less useful. It is an inventory or compendium of the state in action and is full of interesting and valuable information. Several good illustrations and two maps appear.

The work needs careful revision as it contains many errors. For instance, on pages 9 and 10 it would appear from the data given that it was the percentage of the native element, not foreign, which had decreased in the period mentioned. Again, near the foot of page 10, there is obviously something wrong with the statement that, "In the United States in 1908, the urban population amounted to 46.3% and in 1910 to 40.5%." Again, on page 11, the data given calls for 11.4% instead of 13.3%. In the next paragraph, the percentages of natives born in other states should total 9.4 instead of 4.8, if the previous statement is correct. All these errors occurring within two pages are apt to shake one's confidence in the text. Again, in writing of William Penn, page 22, the dates there given, 1644 and 1688, should be 1664 and 1668 respectively. On page 29, the date November 22, 1757, should be November 24, 1758, for the fall of Fort Duquesne. Two dates are given for the founding of the

university of Pennsylvania (pp. 52 and 225). Thomas Jefferson, who was then in France, could hardly be called a "leading spirit in the framing of the Constitution of the United States" (p. 56). The Johnstown flood entailed the loss of some 2,200 lives, not 3,000 (p. 80). In naming "places of special religious interest" (p. 202), more explanation of those mentioned and the inclusion of some others might be desired. Allegheny college is a Methodist school, not Presbyterian, and Juniata is Dunker or Brethren, not Baptist (p. 227).

H. J. Webster

Chronicles of Pennsylvania. From the English revolution to the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1688-1748. By Charles P. Keith. In two volumes. (Philadelphia: Charles P. Keith, 1917. 456 p.; 525 p. $5.00)

In the words of the preface, "A comprehensive chronicle of the most neglected period is attempted to be supplied in these volumes, detailing what took place in each year, but sometimes pursuing a topic beyond the year in question." It is the purpose of the chronicler to bridge the gap from a few years after the coming of Penn to just before the outbreak of the seven years war, thus presenting much material which is omitted by most of the historians. All available sources seem to have been used in this work, though references to them are embodied in the narrative of the text with no separate bibliography or footnotes. The twenty-seven chapters cover a wide range of historical material — political, legal, biographical, racial, religious, educational, financial, and military. If anything is omitted it is probably because the chronicler found no body of material upon it for this comparatively quiet period of sixty years, for which the important sources are not inexhaustible.

A good insight is given into the history of the Penn family and its relations to the colony. Penn is characterized as "more of a statesman than a saint, a better preacher than a business man, a rather weak ruler, but, considering the people he had to deal with, including kings, Quakers, and Indians, and his general success . . . the greatest of the long line of Pennsylvania politicians." (p. 164). The relations with the Indians are duly considered as is also the coming of the sects and their early history. The politics centered about the proprietors, governors, and assemblies. The governors were mediocre men usually without higher education and were in a difficult position between the kings and proprietors on the one hand and the assemblies representing the people on the other. The Quakers were firm and fearless in opposition, and there were frequent contests between assemblies and governors.

The accounts of the different sects and of religious dissensions are good. In the split in the Society of Friends due to the preaching of George Keith, the latter is upheld by the author in his demand for a

formal creed. The interesting observation is made (p. 815) that the Schwenkfelders in their doctrine resembling that of the "inner light," in disuse of the sacraments, and in refusing to fight, anticipated the Quakers. The great awakening in which Whitefield participated in Pennsylvania was marked by a split in the Presbyterian church into the "old side" and "new side." One of the assets of the "new side" was the famous "log college" founded by the Reverend William Tennent at Neshaminy about 1728, the first divinity school in the colony and the forerunner of Princeton. A good account is given of the visits and preaching of Whitefield and of the works of the founders of religious sects who sought refuge in Pennsylvania, such as Zinzendorf, Muhlenburg, Schwenkfeld, and Tennent.

The services of James Logan, the scholar of the colony, and of Benjamin Franklin, its "second founder," are recorded. Institutional developments, such as the establishment and continuance from 1720 to 1736 of the only court of chancery ever in Pennsylvania, the founding of the William Penn charter school by the Quakers in 1689, the founding of the *American weekly mercury* in 1719, as the first weekly in Pennsylvania and the third in the colonies, the founding of the "log college" above referred to in 1728 and of the university of Pennsylvania in 1749, are of course all recorded. The fact that others besides the Quakers bought their lands from the Indians is well known.

There is much of real interest and information in these volumes and much detail of minor importance. Many pages might be omitted without much loss to history, and there seems to be little discrimination between the important and unimportant. All the facts obtainable seem to have been brought into the *Chronicles* in one place or another. The style of the chronicler too is uninspiring and many of the sentences are cumbrous. A separate and critical bibliography and citations to authorities would add much to the usefulness of the work for reference. A good synopsis, but without page references, heads each of the chapters, and a good index concludes the second volume.

H. J. Webster

The story of Lancaster: old and new. Being a narrative of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, from 1730 to the centennial year, 1918. By William Riddle. (Lancaster: William Riddle, 1917. 292 p. $1.50 net)

Few towns in the interior of the United States can lay claim to anything like such an interesting history as Lancaster, Pennsylvania. For many years it enjoyed the distinction of being the largest interior town in the country. The continental congress, fleeing from Philadelphia before the British army, took refuge there for a day on its way to the greater safety of York. From 1799 to 1812 Lancaster was the capital of

Pennsylvania. Here during the revolution were confined a number of British prisoners, among them Major John Andre, who was later exchanged, captured again, and finally sent to the scaffold. Here also resided Edward Shippen, the grandfather of the wife of Benedict Arnold, Andre's co-conspirator. This Edward Shippen was the grandson of the first of that name, who was the first mayor of Philadelphia and acting governor of Pennsylvania. Edward Shippen of Lancaster was also the father-in-law of Colonel James Burd, who won the battle of Loyalhanna on October 12, 1758, which resulted in the capture of Fort Duquesne. Colonel Burd was also a resident of Lancaster and one of the town burgesses, as well as an officer in the American army during the revolutionary war. Here Robert Fulton, a native of Lancaster county, pursued his art studies, and here lived James Buchanan, Pennsylvania's only president; and Thaddeus Stevens, who played so large a part in congress during the civil war and reconstruction days.

This volume is written by an octogenarian, a lifelong resident of the city, who frequently takes the privilege of age and long experience to digress from the bald statement of historical facts and to interpolate his own opinions and speculations. Nevertheless he has collected much valuable data, although he has by no means exhausted the field.

Lancaster had its beginning in 1730. The county of the same name, of which it was shortly made the county seat, had been created from Chester county, one of the three original Pennsylvania counties, during the preceding year. The town was laid out in 1770 by James Hamilton, a Philadelphian, who inherited its site and much other property from his father, Andrew Hamilton. James Hamilton was a man of note, having been successively a member of the Pennsylvania assembly, mayor of Philadelphia, lieutenant governor of Pennsylvania, and governor from 1759 to 1763. He it was who secured the location of the county seat at Lancaster. The subsequent importance of the town was increased by the fact that through Lancaster passed the main road from Philadelphia to Harris's Ferry, now Harrisburg, the chief crossing place of the Susquehanna river, and through which for years went a great tide of emigration to the west. The further fact that the town was the center of a rich farming country contributed to its growth and prosperity.

The book contains interesting extracts from the minutes of the borough council from 1742 to 1818, when the place became a city. It was to celebrate the centennial of this event that the book was written. An interesting document is the letter of Chief Burgess Edward Hand, who had been a revolutionary general of note. This letter, dated March 17, 1789, was addressed to the United States congress urging the merits of Lancaster as the site for the nation's capital. It stated among other

things that there were in 1786 no less than 678 houses in the town, many of which it declared were large and elegant and would accommodate congress and its suite without inconvenience. Boarding and lodging were to be had at very easy rates. Springs and wells abounded. There were five public buildings including an elegant courthouse, fifty by forty-eight feet. In the second story thereof was a handsome room thirty-two by forty-four feet in the clear, and two convenient adjoining rooms, each being sixteen by twenty-two feet in the clear. In these rooms it was thought the congress of the United States could be comfortably accommodated. There were also several places of worship, and the population of the place was computed at 4,200 souls. This was a strong presentation for those days, much stronger than could be made by Harrisburg, which was seriously considered for the capital; the site of Washington as we know was then occupied by but a few scattered houses.

The volume tells of various steps in the growth of Lancaster, the building of waterworks, gas works, and city halls, the construction of canals and railroads. Allusion is made to the massacre of the Indians at Lancaster by the Paxton men. The book notes Lafayette's visit to Lancaster during his final tour of the country. Many other interesting incidents are noted, and the volume will be welcomed as a worth while contribution to our local history. The illustrations are particularly valuable. They include a general view of old Lancaster in 1810, and of a number of ancient structures dating back to colonial and revolutionary days.

BURD S. PATTERSON

The anti-slavery movement in Kentucky prior to 1850. By Asa Earl Martin, assistant professor of American history, Pennsylvania state college. [Filson club publication number twenty-nine] (Louisville, Kentucky: Standard printing company, 1918. 165 p. $2.00)

This latest publication of the Filson club, in its new form, is one that deserves favorable mention. The author has been diligent in the examination of his sources and has put the narrative in clear and interesting form. The general tone is one of impartiality suitable to the discussion of such a subject.

The book shows a much more extensive sentiment against the slavery system in Kentucky than has been generally realized. The period under consideration begins with the "First attack on slavery" by the pioneer settlers of the revolutionary period, and ends with the "Constitutional convention of 1849," when the last effort was made to abolish slavery by legal means.

The conflict between the slavery and antislavery forces, for the most part, crystallized about the constitutional conventions of 1792, 1799, 1849, and the passage of the non-importation act of 1833. The pioneer

population failed to secure an article in the first constitution making it possible to emancipate slaves largely because of the influence of Colonel George Nicholas, who "had not yet learned the ways of the West nor comprehended where the interests of the new commonwealth were different from what suited or seemed to suit Virginia and her people." Again, in 1799, an attempt was made by antislavery leaders to change the constitution, but the original article was little altered and permitted emancipation only "with the consent of the owners and with full compensation in money." At this time Henry Clay used his influence against slavery which he believed to be opposed to the best interests of the state in its future development.

The non-importation act of 1833 was a partial victory for the opponents of slavery, but it did not prevent the bringing in of slaves, except for the purpose of sale, and it left intact the right to inherit slaves. The repeal of this act was an object of constant effort on the part of the slavery party; but the law existed until 1849 when its most important provisions were repealed.

Previous to the convention of 1849 a notable gathering of antislavery leaders met at Frankfort, and an active campaign was carried on over the state to elect to the convention delegates favorable to an emancipation article. It did not succeed, however, and the new constitution made emancipation more difficult than before and "more firmly established and safeguarded the institution of slavery in the state." The freedom of speech in regard to the subject shows, however, that much progress really had been made.

The book shows the dependence of the slavery system on the development of the tobacco industry and the localization of sentiment according to the character of the soil. The strong influence of the church against slavery and the attitude of leading men both for and against the system is fully brought out.

The failure to attain emancipation by constitutional means led to the establishment of societies for voluntary emancipation, which thrived for a time, but waned when the hope of legal emancipation grew less, because slaveholders were unwilling to make the sacrifice when others were not compelled to do so.

The antislavery sentiment in Kentucky previous to 1850 was mainly in favor of gradual emancipation and was accompanied with some form of colonization of the negroes as they became free. Both moral and economic motives actuated the advocates of the cause. There is very little evidence in the book that there was any appreciation of the negro as a free man or any responsibility for improving him in order that he might become a factor in the industrial development of the state as a co-laborer with the white race.

The author intends to follow this volume with another which will bring the subject through the period of the civil war and deal with the later problems. He expresses the wish that his study may stimulate others to do a similar work for other states of the south, and it is to be hoped that the suggestion may be followed.

JAMES R. ROBERTSON

Frontier retreat on the upper Ohio, 1779-1781. Edited with introduction and notes by Louise Phelps Kellogg. [Publications of the State historical society of Wisconsin, Collections, XXIV, Draper series, V] (Madison: State historical society of Wisconsin, 1917. 549 p. $1.50)

The publication of this volume places students of the American revolution under obligation to Miss Kellogg for making more accessible some of the valuable material to be found in the Draper collection. *Frontier retreat on the upper Ohio*, together with *Dunmore's war*, 1774; *Revolution on the upper Ohio*, 1775-1777; *Frontier defense on the upper Ohio*, 1777-1778; the last three under the editorship of Reuben Gold Thwaites and Miss Kellogg, and *Frontier advance on the upper Ohio*, 1778-1779, edited by Miss Kellogg, give the essential documents for the story of the revolution in the west between 1774 and July, 1781.

The historical introduction of twenty-five pages supplies a satisfactory interpretation of the nearly five hundred documents covering the two critical years of western history, 1779-1781. During the summer of 1779, Colonel Daniel Brodhead, commandant at Fort Pitt, made a successful advance against the Iroquois which ended, for the time, their domination over the western tribes. At the same time, George Rogers Clark was dictating terms to the tribes which were not under the immediate protection of British arms, and officials at Detroit and Mackinac feared an early attack by the Americans. The carrying out of this plan by Clark, with his available force of three hundred and fifty men, was not feasible.

Early in 1780, the British and Indians attempted an advance in force from Mackinac and Detroit against the upper Mississippi and Kentucky posts. Both movements were defeated through the activity of Clark. During the remaining months of that year and the first half of 1781, there ensued the tory uprising in the back counties of Virginia and a succession of Indian raids against the frontier settlements. The petty, selfish spirit manifested by Colonel Brodhead made a coöperative expedition against the British strongholds impracticable and numerous frontier posts were abandoned.

In addition to the documents in the volume selected from the Draper collection, some forty others were procured from the Washington papers in the library of congress. Documents previously printed essential to the narrative are summarized. There is a good index and the explanatory

notes are ample. The sentences at the bottom of page 30 of the introduction are evidently out of place in the narrative.

J. A. James

Illinois and the nation. A practical treatise on state and national civics. By Oliver R. Trowbridge, member of the Bloomington bar, and Gilbert P. Randle, superintendent of schools, Danville. (Chicago: A. Flanagan company, 1917. 312 p. $.60)

One third of this manual is given to the texts of the national and Illinois constitutions and the civil administrative code of that state. It seems to have been the authors' intention to make as brief a treatise as possible covering all essential facts concerning the organization and to some extent the working of the Illinois and national governments. There is no attempt to enter the field of "community civics," there is no effort to appeal to the special interests of boys and girls or to foster their civic virtues. Departments of government are outlined, lists of officers are given, salaries are stated, and duties are enumerated — all in the style of a reference manual. There is scarcely anything here about the non-official government that goes on through the work of political parties and other voluntary agencies. There is little about the ordinary processes of local government.

Most of the chapters are followed by "questions and topics for study," which if faithfully followed would go far towards putting vitality and interest into an otherwise dry compilation. This book has several good maps and illustrations.

Albert H. Sanford

Historic Mackinac. The historical, picturesque and legendary features of the Mackinac country. Illustrated from sketches, drawings, maps and photographs, with an original map of Mackinac island, made especially for this work. By Edwin O. Wood, LL.D. In two volumes. (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 697, 773 p. $12.50)

To pass upon the merits of the two volumes entitled *Historic Mackinac* and say it was well done, it would seem necessary only to refer to the list of the historical connections of the author, Edwin O. Wood, printed upon the title page. That anyone could have so historic a setting and fail to evolve the spirt necessary for doing historical work would seem scarcely possible.

The author very modestly states that the "volumes make no claim to rank with the achievements of historians," and it is hardly to be expected that a mere compilation in annalistic form could take rank with an historical work involving the research necessary for a new interpretation and a scholarly production. No attempt has been made even to restate in an original manner the history of, or to add a new interpreta-

tion to, the founding and development of Mackinac; but the writer has handled the subject chiefly from the viewpoint of others, selecting and quoting extensively such portions of other works as appealed to his interest in this delightful locality. Many valuable illustrations have been used, which in themselves call for commendation; they are well chosen and equally well executed.

The title *Historic Mackinac* suggests the class of book intended as a guide book, but these two volumes could hardly be carried about and referred to, and the average traveler to the island will probably content himself with a more condensed sketch. The work should be accepted at the writer's own valuation as "the attempt of a layman to bring together" from the materials he had at hand "some leading features which seem to be of especial interest." Since the compilation was not a scholarly attempt, no criticism need be made; but in view of that fact, the reviewer would have preferred an interpretation of the writer's own impressions as acquired through his intimate association with the region, aided by his evident extensive readings and study of its history and legends, rather than the quotations and excerpts from others, particularly modern historians such as Parkman, Nevins and Cooley, whose writings can be best read in the original. There seems no reason why one so versed in the materials to be had need to have relied so completely on the wording of others, especially when by so doing the work has been made unnecessarily extensive.

The first volume of 697 pages is given over to an historical narrative covering three centuries of French, British and American occupation. The last chapter is devoted to a description of places of interest at Mackinac island, followed by an appendix of some ninety pages composed of quoted writings and letters, with a chronological summary. The second volume continues the narrative as set forth by other writers, the entire volume being almost exclusively selections from Schoolcraft, Parkman, Mrs. Jameson, Mrs. Kinzie and others. The last chapter of volume II describes the "plants, ferns, and their allies" of the island, and closes with an extensive bibliography of some 59 pages showing the diligence with which Mr. Wood has pursued his subject.

To the reader who wishes to have the various impressions of the numerous writers visiting Mackinac island, and yet will not take the time to read their works separately, the two volumes of Mr. Wood will be a boon. His selections are well chosen and interestingly put together, and while we may bemoan the necessity of producing a book for sketchy readers, we must confess that there are many of them and to such this work is commended.

IDRESS HEAD ALVORD

Reconstruction in Louisiana after 1868. With a page of errata and addenda. By Ella Lonn, Ph.D., assistant professor in Grinnell college, Grinnell, Iowa. (New York: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1918. 538 p. $3.00 net)

Despite some examples of careless English, this is a very interesting as well as a decidedly valuable book. Its keynote is fairness. A native of the unionist portion of the country, Miss Lonn has carefully examined the sources, human as well as manuscript and printed, both in Louisiana and elsewhere. By conversation and correspondence with participants in the events she relates, she has sought to get at the real facts. Where the evidence is so conflicting, or so unreliable as to be of little value, she frankly states the fact, and after recounting the various claims, leaves the reader to decide for himself. In most cases, however, she has not hesitated to state her own opinion, whether it be the orthodox one or not. The evidence deduced usually leads the reader to concur. While by no means an apology for the democrats of Louisiana, nor even a glossing-over of their transgressions during this stormy era, the book is remarkable for its absence of sectional bias.

The first chapter, while not based solely thereon, summarizes the period covered by Ficklen's uncompleted *History of reconstruction in Louisiana through 1868,* and serves as an introduction to the rest of the volume. Next comes a minute analysis of the carpet-bag legislature's activities for 1869-1870. One of the few faults of this study is, perhaps, the particularity with which most of the legislative sessions are discussed in several chapters. There was such sameness in their venality that it seems unprofitable (not to say uninteresting) to catalog all their sins. The rise of Governor Warmoth, his abuse of power, his breach with his associates, and the resulting struggle for control, are then conscientiously and accurately narrated.

Two chapters are devoted to the election of 1872 and the canvas thereof. Though the frauds and intimidations perpetrated by democrats, in their despairing efforts to oust the vultures from the body politic, are frankly and fairly stated, the author plainly shows that the constitution of the board of canvassers, as well as its methods, was illegal, whence, as a result, the returns were made effective, not by law but by the backing the radical government received from federal bayonets.

A discussion of the period of dual government (Kellogg *v.* McEnery) is followed by an able treatment of the national government's failure to meet the issue presented by the Louisiana election. The titles, "Democratic desperation," "The September rebellion," and "The banditti legislature" give a fair idea of the nature of the next three chap-

ters. Louisiana's appearance before congress, again, with the ensuing "Wheeler compromise," whereby the dispute was submitted to a congressional committee, while Kellogg was left in the governor's chair, brings the narrative to the election of 1876. Three chapters are devoted to this, and they show clearly that, though — as was to be expected — the conservatives resorted to some questionable and violent practices, a fair count of the votes would have given them the state. The board of canvassers was not even consistent in its frauds.

Avowedly, it is not a part of the author's plan to discuss the bearings of this election on the Hayes-Tilden contest. This is to be regretted. A chapter on this subject by so fairminded and careful a scholar as Miss Lonn would have given the facts in their appropriate setting, even if, as is probable, no new facts were brought to light. Having shown the forgery of returns in Louisiana, it would have been a decidedly interesting contribution for her to have followed this forgery through the electoral commission.

The concluding chapter deals with the restoration of the white rule. This is followed by a well-arranged bibliography, four maps, and a fair index.

Necessarily, the book deals almost entirely with the political phases of reconstruction, and only incidentally touches upon the economic and social effects.

It is a pity that so fine a book is marred by a few faults that might easily have been avoided. There are several cases of careless proofreading, such as "fraudently" for fraudulently (p. 94), and "Walter G. Brown" for William Garrott Brown (p. 531). Again, Miss Lonn refers too casually to many minor actors in the drama, who are not at all familiar to a reader without a considerable knowledge of Louisiana history. For instance, a reference is made (p. 309) to the report on the contest of Sheridan *v.* Pinchback. The two mentions — without explanation — of Sheridan in this paragraph are the only allusions to him in the book. Of course, G. A. Sheridan, the carpet-bagger who ran against Pinchback (the colored lieutenant governor) for congressman-at-large, is referred to. But, as both before and after this the various activities in Louisiana of General P. H. Sheridan are discussed, the chance for confusion is obvious. Coushatta is not (p. 265) "perhaps a hundred miles farther up the Red River than Colfax." Neither by rail nor river is it much over two-thirds that distance. Since the total poulation of Louisiana in 1870 was less than 727,000, it is doubtful if (p. 132) 400,000 men had been enrolled in less than twenty-four hours in January, 1872.

The defect that will militate most against the book's popularity in

Louisiana is in map 3, which divides the voters in Plaquemine parish into "colored" and "white and Creole." Apparently the author has fallen into the common but inexcusable error of considering a Creole a person of mixed blood. It is — or should be — well-known, (see Murray, *New English dictionary*) that a Creole is a *white* person of Spanish or French ancestry, born in America. Originally the word, (Spanish *criollo*, French *Créole*) had practically the same significance as "colonial" had in English. The reviewer cannot resist this opportunity of stating again the derivation of the word, as so many Louisianians have been mortified by this misconception, whereas many otherwise well-informed persons from other sections have been embarrassed by their ignorance of this fact. Our English word Creole got into the language by way of America, as did those other Louisiana terms, "bulldoze" and "bayou." The Anglo-Americans got it from the French *Créole*, which was in turn derived from the Spanish *criollo*, meaning "native to the locality." Apparently this was a colonial corruption of *criadillo*, a diminutive of *criado*, "bred," which comes from the Spanish verb, *criar*, which is from the Latin *creare*. According to the *New English dictionary* the term *criollo* was first applied by D'Acosta (1590) to *Spaniards born in the West Indies*. This was to distinguish them alike from the Indians, negroes, and the like, and the *peninsulares*, or Spaniards born in the Iberian peninsula. Grimstone's (1604) English translation of D'Acosta gave "crollo." Dampier's *Voyage* (1697) in the English translation had "cirole." *Common sense*, (1737) gives "Creole." Of course, when in 1768 the Spaniards took over Louisiana from the French, they naturally brought the word with them, and equally naturally, the French colonists softened it to *Créole*.

But these are minor defects in an excellent book. It is to be hoped that Miss Lonn will soon bring out a revised edition, after visiting parts of the state other than New Orleans. Though she has made a careful study of the many sources there, she would have found that a visit to Shreveport, Baton Rouge, Coushatta, Colfax, Alexandria, Monroe, and Clinton, would have well repaid the expenditure of time and effort. As it is, she has done as too many Louisianians have, *i.e.* written history largely from the viewpoint of the state's metropolis. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the volume is a very interesting and decidedly valuable contribution to the history of Louisiana and to that of the reconstruction era. The present writer will look forward with interest to other contributions from this author.

Milledge L. Bonham, Jr.

The voices of our leaders. A collection of addresses delivered by statesmen of the United States and her allies in the great war. Compiled by William Mather Lewis. (New York: Hinds, Hayden, Eldredge, 1917. 159 p. $1.00)

This work seems to have been designed to serve two purposes. It was compiled by William M. Lewis, executive secretary of the national committee of patriotic societies and serves admirably as material for propaganda among those elements of our poulation not yet fully abreast of the national achievements. This would seem to be its chief function and for that portion of the public to which such an appeal would be made, the number and brevity of the selections used is undoubtedly well adopted. From the suggestions to public speakers in the preface it would seem, also, that the publishers had in mind to offer their booklet as material for instruction in public speaking. At best, however, the work is but a fragmentary record of a few of the many interesting episodes in the history of the present war.

Lincoln in Illinois. By Octavia Roberts. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin company, 1918. 119 p.)

This interesting and tasty volume is an attempt to revive for the younger generation the memories of Lincoln and his mid-western home which have been treasured by his townsmen to perpetuate the spirit of Lincoln through the story of his associations in the everyday surroundings of the Illinois prairies. Supplemented by a few dozen excellent and artistic drawings, a series of pen pictures portrays Lincoln piloting the *Talisman* up the Sangamon river, keeping store and reading law at New Salem, and figuring in a series of episodes in the state capitol at Springfield. In this interesting text tradition is assisted by an active historical imagination; indeed, quite unconsciously the writer shifts from the past to the present tense and lingers affectionately over what Lincoln "must have done." It is evident that there is little that is new in such a study that can stand the test of historical criticism; but the volume is not an essay in the realm of research. It is an inspired attempt to pass on cherished memories of Lincoln to a wider world.

Sam Houston. By George S. Bryan. (New York: Macmillan company, 1917. 183 p. $.50)

The series of brief biographies to which Mr. Bryan's little volume on Sam Houston belongs is designed, according to the publisher's statement, not only to give to boys and girls intimate pictures of our "greatest national heroes" but also to set forth ideals of character for their emulation. The pungent personality and romantic career of Sam Houston make him a peculiarly attractive subject for the entertainment of

youth, but one must regret that the less spectacular but more constructive and generally Stephen F. Austin could not have been accorded a place in such a series.

Mr. Bryan tells the story well. The style is clear, easy, and interesting. Without pretense of revealing new material or even a new point of view, the author follows closely the work of other writers, notably Williams, and sticks closely to the well authenticated events. While in admiration of his hero he attributes to him more of ability than some careful scholars are inclined to admit, still he is not without discrimination in his laudation nor is he blind to certain obvious faults of "Old Sam." Considering the brevity of treatment, the frontier environment which shaped Houston's character and career is sketched in with the narrative effectively.

The book will be of value only to those for whom it was intended, for it is too brief for the mature reader. Moreover, it practically closes with Houston's presidency and gives but the faintest outline of his later life — which may be justified on the ground that the later period would be less interesting to boys. The narrative of the Texas revolution would be clearer with a good sketch map. There is no index.

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL

Life of Robert E. Lee. For boys and girls. By J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton and Mary Thompson Hamilton. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917. 209 p. $1.25 net)

This book was written mainly from secondary sources and makes no claim to any great addition to the sum of knowledge about General Robert E. Lee. It is a book for American boys and girls of the present generation. In making better known to them the character and purity of motive of Lee and those he served in the capacity of soldier and educator, the authors hope to hasten the time when the last trace of bitterness between the north and the south shall have disappeared in a true Americanism. In placing chief emphasis upon the home life of Lee, his consideration for others, and his unselfish love for Virginia, the authors have done much to bring about this desired end. Also, the book seems to have appeared at an opportune time. No better time could have been found for emphasizing Americanism, by a study of the lives of those who have helped to determine it, than that in which the sons and daughters of all sections of our great country are serving under a common flag in the cause of humanity.

CHARLES H. AMBLER

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Owing to conditions induced by the war the *Review* has been obliged to omit the article on "Historical activities of the Trans Mississippi northwest."

Because of the influenza epidemic the annual meeting of the Ohio Valley historical association, announced to convene at Berea, Kentucky, October seventeen to nineteen, was indefinitely postponed.

A classified list of the publications of the Carnegie institution of Washington was issued April 17, 1917; "copies of each publication . . . are sent gratuitously to a carefully selected list of the greater libraries of the world, while the remainder of the edition is held for sale at a price sufficient only to cover the cost of publication and transportation to purchasers." Price lists or descriptive lists will be furnished correspondents upon request.

A check list of the literature and other material in the library of congress on the European war has been compiled under the direction of Herman H. B. Meyer, chief bibliographer, with the coöperation of the members of the library staff.

The *Political science quarterly* for September, 1918, offers the "Limitations of the Ricardian theory of rent," by William R. Camp; "Canada's national grain route," by Edward Porritt; "The British war cabinet," by Robert Livingston Schuyler; and "Collective bargaining before the supreme court," by Thomas Reed Powell. In addition to the regular issue for September a *Supplement* is published in which Horace M. Kallen and Edward M. Sait give a "Record of political events" from August 1, 1917 to July 31, 1918.

"Stephen Girard," by Hugh T. Henry; "The Catholic church in British Honduras (1851-1918)," by Frederich C. Hopkins; and "The Aglípay Schism in the Phillipines," by James Alexander Robertson makes up the October, 1918, *Catholic historical review.*

Fred Landon's study of "The Buxton settlement in Canada," which was "in many respects the most important attempt made before the Civil War to found a Negro refugee colony in Canada," and twenty-five pages of documents reflecting "What the framers of the federal con-

stitution thought of the negro'' are among the valuable contributions to the October, 1918, *Journal of negro history.*

In the October, 1918, *Illinois Catholic historical review* Gilbert J. Garraghan concludes his study of ''Early Catholicity in Chicago, 1673-1843;'' while under the title of ''Catholic progress in Chicago,'' William J. Orahan, by way of personal recollections, continues the story of Chicago catholicity, taking it up in 1854 and carrying it down to the present. In this same number there also appear several letters of Bishop William Quarter, bearing on the early history of the church in Illinois: ''History in the annals of the Leopodine association,'' as well as ''Documents about Kaskaskia,'' written by Benedict Roux in 1838, and here edited by John Rothensteiner.

The index to the *Review of historical publications relating to Canada,* edited by George M. Wrong, H. H. Langdon, and W. Setwart Wallace has been compiled by Laura Mason and published as volumes XI-XX of the *University of Toronto studies.*

In the January, 1918, *Pennsylvania magazine of history and biography,* Charles I. Landis begins a ''History of the Philadelphia and Lancaster turnpike;'' aside from being the first long turnpike in the United States, the story of this road is of interest and value as involving the whole early system of transportation from Philadelphia to the west.

In the October, 1918, *Western Pennsylvania historical magazine,* C. W. Dahlinger presents ''Old Allegheny'' — the beginning, the growth, and the maturity of a typical industrial town in Pennsylvania.

The *Ohio archaeological and historical quarterly* publishes a report of the twenty-third annual meeting of the Ohio state archæological and historical society as its October, 1918, issue.

In 1817 Thomas Dean, in company with a small party of Brotherton Indians, made a journey by water from central New York to central Indiana; the journal he kept on this unique trip, edited by John Candee Dean has been published as number two of volume six in the Indiana historical society *Publications.*

''The Bennett law in Wisconsin,'' not only its political significance in the past but its social significance as revealed in the present world crisis, is most ably discussed by Louise Phelps Kellogg in the September, 1918, *Wisconsin magazine of history.*

''Social work at Camp Dodge'' comprises the October, 1918, *Iowa journal of history and politics.* Therein the author, using Camp Dodge as

a concrete example, endeavors to describe the varied and effectively organized social life of military camps in the United States — "a unique and remarkably successful manifestation of teamwork." In conclusion he raises the question of applying the same scientific methods to the training of citizens in time of peace: "Why not provide for the physical, mental and moral life of our citizens with the same purposes in mind and with the same broad point of view? Can we not better afford to train citizens for peace than for war?"

In the August, 1918, *Minnesota history bulletin*, Chessley J. Posey consumes ten pages in a wordy discussion of the "Influence of geographic factors in the development of Minnesota."

An excellent sketch of the "Memphis railroad convention, 1849" by R. S. Cotterill; concrete, and well organized "Suggestions as to the equipment needed for the teaching of history," by St. George L. Sioussat, and a continuation of "Indian wars and warriors of the old southwest," by Albert V. Goodpasture make up the June, 1918, *Tennessee historical magazine.*

In the *Missouri historical review* for October, 1918, Floyd C. Shoemaker indicates the interplay of "Missouri and the war" and J. Willard Ridings, under "Missourians abroad" gives a sketch of Edward R. Stettinus — "the ablest spender the world has ever known."

Herbert Davenport and Joseph K. Wells publish the initial installment of "The first Europeans in Texas, 1528-1536" in the October, 1918, *Southwestern historical quarterly*; this vivid prologue to the history of Texas — the adventures of ship wrecked explorers among the Texan aborigines — not only compels the attention of the anthropologist but "rivals Robinson Crusoe and the Odyssey for romantic interest."

THERE IS NOT ROOM HERE TO TELL YOU ABOUT THE NEW BREASTED ANCIENT, HARDING EUROPEAN, HART AMERICAN

HISTORY MAPS

You must see these maps to appreciate them. We ship them entirely on approval. The best schools in the land are using them. These include universities, colleges, normal schools, and high schools.

For full particulars fill in, cut out, and mail the coupon below.

DENOYER-GEPPERT COMPANY

AMERICA'S LEADING SCHOOL MAP PUBLISHERS

406 EAST OHIO STREET :: :: CHICAGO

GENTELMEN: Send particulars on items checked:

☐ Breasted Ancient History Maps
☐ Harding European History Maps
☐ Hart-Bolton American History Maps

Name _____

School _____

Address _____

MVHR 9-18

The Formation of the State of Oklahoma, 1803-1906

(University of California Publications In History, Vol. VI)

By Roy Gittinger, Professor of History in the University of Oklahoma

A most interesting and well written history of the development of practically the whole southwestern part of the country. — *Springfield Republican.*

The admission of Oklahoma in 1906 brought to a close the formation of states from the Louisiana Purchase. Dr. Gittinger writes of the events, mainly connected with our national Indian policy, which withheld the area from statehood for a much longer period than the rest of the acquisition. It is a story of the stoppage of the westward movement and of its reopening under pressure from the landgrant railroad and the settler. The barrier removed, the population rose in fifteen years from a few thousand to a million and a half. This scholarly work is based on documentary sources, is well written, and intensely interesting.

268 pages, cloth, $2.00, carriage extra

The University of California Press

Berkley, California 280 Madison Avenue, N. Y.

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. V, NO. 4 MARCH, 1919

COMMERCIAL INTERCOURSE WITH THE CONFEDERACY IN THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY, 1861-1865[1]

Among the many changes brought about by the outbreak of the civil war none was harder to realize than the fact that the country was in reality divided. The sway of two presidents where only one had ruled before made in itself no immediate great difference outside the realm of the mind and the imagination. But the fact that a well-knit economic unit had been suddenly broken squarely in two was fraught with the most perplexing consequences. That the northern and southern portions of the United States were almost absolutely dependent upon each other, and that neither part could live alone economically, was everywhere recognized. With such an attitude of mind prevailing, the war was begun and fought for months before a real change came. In fact too many people, obsessed with the idea of "business as usual," never realized that to fight an enemy and trade with him at the same time was contrary to good military strategy as well as to the theory of international law.

The problems that met the United States government in dealing with this question were almost insurmountable—in fact many of them were never settled until the causes that produced them ceased to exist. In the first place, it was difficult for the commercial classes to comprehend the fact that one of the most important movements in the whole field of American commercial activities, the trade between the north and the south, should absolutely cease. Again, the difficulty of determining exactly the limits of the southern confederacy and, therefore, the fron-

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Paul, May 10, 1918.

tiers across which no trade should go was soon evident. Furthermore, in the early days of the secession movement the question arose as to what attitude was to be taken toward such border states as Kentucky and Missouri. Should they while trying to make up their minds as to their allegiance serve as a highway and supply station for stocking the confederacy with war materials, or should the federal government restrict trade with them and thereby run the risk of driving them into the arms of the south? Even after the limits of the confederacy were once fixed, it was soon evident that its area would not be a constant quantity. What attitude, then, should be assumed toward the conquered territory in trading with its inhabitants? It was not a foregone conclusion that a policy of complete and absolute stoppage of all trade in every sense with the confederacy would be desirable, in view of the fact that certain southern products, especially cotton, were almost a necessity for the successful waging of the war. Even with all these problems settled, the question as to who should be responsible for carrying out any policy the government should adopt remained to complicate the situation. To make conditions still more complex, on account of human weakness too prone to go unchecked in the face of almost unlimited opportunities for gain, the announced policy and trade regulations of the government very seldom were actually and fully carried out.

The government vacillated from an intention, announced in the beginning, of completely stopping trade with the insurrectionary regions to an almost unrestricted intercourse near the end of the war. The policy at any given time was difficult for the persons concerned to untangle from the maze of acts of congress, followed up by rules and regulations of the treasury department, proclamations of the president, and general orders interpreting these given out by army officers. All of which led Rear-Admiral D. D. Porter to say, "It requires a nice distinction on the part of an officer to discriminate in these matters and not run against the regulations of the Treasury Department, and I am sorry to say that some of my command commit blunders enough. I can give them all orders, but I cannot furnish them with brains."[2]

[2] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies* (Washington, 1880-1901), first series, 31: part 1: 781.

As has been intimated, the United States government was slow to adopt any policy whatsoever regarding the breaking of trade between the two sections. For seven months after the confederacy had launched on its career as an independent power, no action had been taken by congress or the president toward laying down a policy concerning commercial intercourse between the north and the south in the Mississippi valley. It is true that the secretary of the treasury, Chase, on May 2, 1861, issued a set of rules "To Collectors, Surveyors, and other Officials of the Customs on the Northern and Northwestern Waters of the United States," which were designed to prevent munitions of war from reaching the confederacy; but they were feeble in their operation and in no way declared a general policy for the United States.[3] On July 13, congress acted by declaring that all commercial intercourse should cease with the insurrectionary regions whenever the president should by proclamation so order; but there was this sinister proviso: "That the President may in his discretion, license and permit commercial intercourse with any such part of said State or section, the inhabitants of which are so declared in a state of insurrection, in such articles, and for such time, and by such persons, as he, in his discretion, may think most conducive to the public interest"—such intercourse to be carried out under rules laid down by the secretary of the treasury.[4] With this clear mandate the president refrained from acting until August 16, when he issued a proclamation declaring all commercial intercourse with the insurrectionary regions at an end "without the special license and permission of the President, through the Secretary of the Treasury."[5] During these seven months of indecision, however, an immense amount of material had been flowing to the confederacy through the border states, especially Kentucky.[6]

[3] *Illinois Weekly State Journal*, May 15, 1861; *Crisis* (Columbus, Ohio), May 16, 1861.

[4] *House of representatives executive documents*, 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 432.

[5] *Ibid.*, 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 428.

[6] See E. M. Coulter, "Effects of secession upon the commerce of the Mississippi valley," in Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 3: 275-300. President Lincoln used great skill and tact in his dealings with the border states during the early period of the secession movement. He was criticised as being criminally negligent and lax in not cutting off trade with such states as Kentucky. The result of his policy was seen in that the border states did not secede.

Through the permit system which soon grew up under the guidance of a multiplicity of treasury regulations, the federal government could play fast and loose in its policy of trading with the insurrectionary regions. In fact at no time during the four years of the war did the government settle down to a policy of absolute non-intercourse with the confederacy. There was constantly present a disturbing element which prevented an air-tight application of the rules, however strict they might be: the government was never quite convinced that it could get along without southern products. At times the secretary of the treasury proposed visionary and fantastic plans whereby the treasury coffers would be almost filled from the profits that might accrue in one way or another from a continuance of this trade. And it is by no means improbable that foreign pressure had its influence on the steadfastness with which the regulations were being carried out. In the light of this, Grant's drive in the west down into Tennessee takes on a new significance as being almost as much a campaign for opening up commerce with that region as for bringing about a military decisison.[7] The whole policy, whatever it might be, harmonized ill with the legal fiction that the states were still in the union. The impossibility of the situation was very shrewdly brought out in the contention of an importer at Boston that he should not pay the customhouse one-half cent a pound import duties on two hundred bales of cotton from New Orleans, as they were "exempt from duty, being the production of the United States returned to this country."[8] Chief Justice Taney in disposing of a case in the federal courts of Maryland declared that one Carpenter who had refused

[7] England and other European nations had early made anxious representations to the United States concerning a relaxation of the blockade of southern ports. Secretary Seward wrote Charles Francis Adams at London in 1862 that trade was reviving so "that it may be expected to increase fast enough to relieve the painful anxieties expressed to us by friendly nations. The President has given respectful consideration to the desire informally expressed to me by the Governments of Great Britain and France for some further relaxation of the blockade in favor of that trade." *American annual cyclopaedia and register of important events* (New York, 1862-1875), 1862, p. 228. This gives new significance to the New Orleans campaign. Immediately upon the capture of that city Seward addressed to foreign diplomats a letter stating that New Orleans and other ports now closed would soon be opened for limited shipments. *Ibid.*

[8] *Merchants' magazine and commercial review*, 48: 493.

to secure a permit was within his right, as congress had no power to restrict or interfere with the domestic and internal commerce of a state.[9]

As the federal government was never settled in its general policy for commercial intercourse, it is to be expected that it would be equally unsettled on important minor parts of that policy. Should the border states be considered as lying outside the restricted area? The policy as embodied in the act of congress of July 13 and the president's proclamation soon following certainly excluded them from any trade restrictions. But the conditions at any given moment were always taken by the treasury department as governing the situation. Kentucky especially came in for particular treatment and is an interesting study in itself. As a general statement it is true that this state for the greater part of the war was regarded more as a member of the southern confederacy than as a part of the United States.[10] By the summer of 1862, rules were in force that all trade on the Ohio river below Wheeling, excepting Louisville, and on the

[9] *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1863, p. 202.

[10] Until 1864 the part of the state beyond the Cumberland river to the west was considered enemy territory and little or no trade was allowed, although much was carried on directly with the confederate forces, despite the rules. This system as it was applied to Kentucky was peculiar. It was largely in the hands of the local federal army officials and at times it was so run into fraud and political proscription as greatly to arouse the whole state. Governor Bramlette in his message to the legislature in January, 1865, said boards of trade had been set up "to pass upon and determine who should buy and sell not only in the ordinary course of trade, but for family supplies. As administered in Kentucky, it was a most shameful and corrupt system of partisan political corruption and oppression." *Kentucky senate journal, 1865* (adjourned session, 1863-1864), 11. For more particulars on this situation see Lewis Collins, *Collins' historical sketches of Kentucky. History of Kentucky . . . revised, enlarged . . . and brought down to . . . 1874, by Richard H. Collins* (Covington, 1874), 1: 147, 156; *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1862, p. 540; also see, for the basis of these regulations, *House of representatives executive documents,* 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 411. The restrictions on Kentucky and Missouri trade were finally removed in 1864, much to the detriment of the federal forces in the field. *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1864, p. 189; *Merchants' magazine and commercial review,* 40: 241; *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 32: part 2: 427; *ibid.,* first series, 41: part 2: 535. D. E. Sickles at Memphis wrote Lincoln, May 31, 1864, "The removal of restrictions upon trade in Kentucky, Missouri, and West Virginia opened an extensive frontier through which the enemy are supplied." *Ibid.,* first series, 39: part 2: 60; 32: part 3: 233; *House reports of committees,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 61, 62.

Mississippi river below the mouth of the Des Moines, excepting St. Louis, should be allowed only by permit.[11]

The license or permit system was a failure from beginning to end. As long as trade was permitted at all, it was sure to come into unworthy hands and to be carried on contrary to law. Elaborate restrictions were thrown up around the securing and use of permits: all steamboats were required to bear treasury officials known as "aids to the revenue" whenever they entered the restricted areas, and all permits had to state the destination, route, consignee, and value of the goods. Trading was to be carried on with loyal people only.[12] Surveyors of the customs at different towns were to grant them and to "use liberally, though cautiously, the discretion with which they are intrusted."[13] It is needless to add that they were more liberal than cautious; for soon old permits were being called in and new ones issued with greater care.[14] In 1863, the power to grant permits was restricted to special agents residing in the larger cities, and no permit could be allowed to run for a longer period than one month.[15]

This system was designed to apply especially to commerce in the invaded regions and, according to the secretary of the trea-

[11] *Senate executive documents*, 37 congress, 3 session, 1: no. 1: 268; *ibid.*, 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 416.

[12] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 13: 698-700; *Senate executive documents*, 37 congress, 3 session, 1: no. 1: 268-270; Collins, *Historical sketches of Kentucky*, 1: 115, 121. There was to be no charge for permits as they "are not intended to impose additional expenses or burdens of any kind upon trade, or to impede or in any manner interfere with the freedom of legitimate and proper transportation and travel." *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 8: 585.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] A fee of twenty cents was required for every permit granted, and a small charge was made for goods taken in and brought out of restricted areas — as for instance, five cents on every hundred dollars' worth of goods above three hundred dollars taken in, and fifty cents on every thousand pounds of cotton brought out. These charges were made merely to provide for the expenses of the system. *Senate executive documents*, 37 congress, 3 session, 1: no. 1: 269; *Cincinnati Daily Commercial*, March 31, 1862.

[15] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 8: 834; *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1863, p. 199. Special agencies existed in the west at Pittsburgh, Wheeling, Cincinnati, Madison, Lawrenceville, New Albany, Evansville, Paducah, Cairo, Quincy, St. Louis, Nashville, and Memphis. *Ibid.*, 1863, p. 200.

sury in 1862, "No licenses or permits have been granted for commerce with the inhabitants of the insurrectionary districts beyond the limits of such occupancy."[16] But often it was difficult to determine what region was occupied and what was not, since armies maneuvered in the open. Furthermore, Grant's rapid progress into Tennessee and beyond made it difficult to be certain that the region was effectively occupied and therefore safe for opening trade. The opportunity for illegal trading here is evident, as trade regulations followed close upon the heels of the army.[17] According to a federal army officer this was "made necessary by the persistent efforts of persons in the loyal States who sympathize with those engaged in the rebellion, and by peddlers and corrupt traffickers, many of whom have come from disloyal States and sections for this purpose, to smuggle goods, medicines, and other supplies through to the insurgents."[18]

By the summer of 1862 Grant's troops had reached the northern part of Alabama and were in the midst of the cotton area. Immediately a mad scramble for cotton set in. Everything seemed to be prostituted toward that end. Army supply trains groaned along laden with cotton instead of provisions and munitions of war. Army officers as well as civilians engaged in the trade. As high as $4,000 was cleared on sixty bales. According to one of the army officers, "I at first let everybody trade in cotton, but soon found my camps infested with Jews, secessionists, and spies, and had to issue an order confining the business to a few, whom I could restrain as sutlers under military law."[19] Another officer in despair wrote, "My hard-earned reputation as a soldier is being frittered away hourly by Southern Traitors and Northern thieves. Cotton is the corrupting element."[20]

In 1863, after the fall of Vicksburg and Port Hudson, the entire course of the Mississippi river was freed from obstructions

[16] *Senate executive documents*, 37 congress, 3 session, 1: no. 1: 27.

[17] *America annual cyclopaedia*, 1862, p. 227; *Cincinnati Daily Commercial*, March 8, 1862; *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 8: 584; 10: part 2: 19; 17: part 2: 21, 396.

[18] *Ibid.*, first series, 17: part 2: 585.

[19] *Ibid.*, first series, 13: 553.

[20] *Ibid.*, first series, 41: part 2: 328. For other phases of this early cotton scramble see *ibid.*, first series, 10: part 2: 80, 262, 638, 639; 16: part 2: 80, 183; *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1862, p. 227.

and soon trade under certain restrictions was allowed through the whole river system. The most flagrant violation of the rules occurred daily. Colonel Lafayette C. Baker, chief of the national detective police, said, "It seems incredible that in the midst of the most tragical scenes that war has ever created, the very arena of conflict should be the busy field of mercenary and lawless trade."[21]

In December, 1863, the first boatload of sugar and molasses arrived in Louisville from New Orleans and the old river trade was soon in full swing again.[22] Boats of every description began plying up every bayou and creek, trading and trafficking with whomever they met. According to General C. C. Washburn, "They invite rebel officers and soldiers on board, and drink and hobnob together."[23]

The war had not been going long before the trade policy of the federal government was in bad need of more exact definition in general as well as in detail. Secretary Chase admitted that "The duty of regulating commercial intercourse . . . between the rebel and the loyal States . . . has been found exceedingly arduous and perplexing."[24] His policy in general was that "commerce should follow the flag."[25] More particularly he would "allow . . . between parts of states fully restored and loyal states . . . the freest commercial intercourse compatible with prevention of supplies to persons within rebel lines." Beyond this region but still within the federal

[21] Lafayette C. Baker, *History of the United States secret service* (Philadelphia, 1867), 368.

[22] Collins, *Historical sketches of Kentucky*, 1: 129. The *Louisville Democrat* on July 22 said, "With a warm glow of satisfaction we inform the public that a boat is loading for New Orleans. . . This day's dawn will break with additional splendor in the Valley of the Mississippi." Quoted in *Cincinnati Daily Commercial*, July 24, 1863. See also *ibid.*, July 25, 27, 1863, *passim*. In an order to the army, General N. P. Banks announced that the trade of New Orleans with the upper Mississippi, Missouri and Ohio rivers "is hereby declared free of any military restrictions whatever." This became effective September 3, 1863. For additional points on the steamboat situation see *Merchants' magazine and commercial review*, 48: 102; *Senate executive documents*, 37 congress, 2 session, 4: no. 2: 181, 183, 200, *passim*.

[23] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 39: part 2: 27; 31: part 3: 361; 32: part 1: 515; 39: part 2: 27.

[24] *House of representatives executive documents*, 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 23.

[25] *Senate executive documents*, 37 congress, 2 session, 4: no. 2: 24.

lines he would allow "such intercourse sanctioned by the commanding general, as may be required to supply the inhabitants with necessaries." Beyond the federal lines "there can be no intercourse except that of a character exclusively military."[26] The act of congress of July 13, 1861, the basis for the treasury rules, was not designed to set up trade relations in the revolted states at all. It seems to have contemplated the taking care of abandoned property and the feeding of the conquered regions rather than the fostering of trade.[27]

On account of the loophole left in the power to the president to grant permits, the whole system demanded revision. The rules of the secretary of the treasury comported ill with the intention of the law. Senator Morrill said, "It is understood that a very large trade has sprung up under these regulations; so that the committee were led to believe that the exception came very near being the rule itself . . . and under these rules and regulations it is believed that a system of general abuse grew up."[28] The first step came in the act of congress of March 12, 1863, which related especially to captured or abandoned property. Secretary Chase said that prior to the passage of this legislation "the status of the law, and the terms of the original proclamation, made it difficult to act with much efficiency or usefulness, and the regulation of the trade was assumed almost exclusively by the military authorities."[29]

The theoretical policy of complete non-intercourse by 1863 began to disintegrate gradually through treasury regulations until by the beginning of 1865 there was almost unrestricted trade and wild speculation. The entering wedge was the division of the occupied area into "special agencies" which in turn were divided into numerous trade districts. Under presumably strict regulations private traders were allowed to set up trade stores, to take in a certain monthly allowance ostensibly for the civilian population, and to take out unlimited amounts.[30]

[26] Secretary Chase to a Memphis agent, July 3, 1863. *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1863, p. 198.

[27] *Senate executive documents*, 37 congress, 2 session, 4: no. 2: 24; *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1865, p. 184.

[28] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, 3: 2821.

[29] *House of representatives executive documents*, 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 23.

[30] This system was set up by elaborate treasury regulations September 11, 1863.

As the armies moved forward the districts, from necessity, were being constantly changed.[31] Commercial intercourse beyond the lines of military occupation was again strictly forbidden,[32] but the order was largely nullified by a provision setting up fantastic "supply districts" which on the very face of the matter would have to exist between the areas occupied by the union and confederate armies—a sort of "no man's land" and a rather dangerous region for trade, to say the least.[33] The allowance of passage for "plantation supplies" was another source of fraudulent trade.[34] The abuses of the trading stations were so flagrant as to cause an honest person to lose faith in the integrity of his fellowman. Memphis was the center of a truly gigantic traffic directly with the confederacy. A federal army officer charged that "Memphis has been of more value to the Southern Confederacy since it fell into Federal hands than Nassau."[35] On one section of the lines, it was estimated, $50,000 worth of supplies was going through to the confederacy every day, and on another section, $100,000 worth. Forty barrels of flour daily were said to have gone through the lines at Vicksburg for a long period of time. Senator Chandler charged that up to June, 1864, between $20,000,000 and $30,000,000 worth of supplies had gone through to the confederacy at Memphis alone.[36] Small unimportant places such as the mouth of the White river and Milliken's Bend supported a traffic completely out of all proportion to the needs of the community. At the former place the trade amounted to $100,000 monthly, and at the latter it was estimated at $1,000 per day. For the whole interior taken together, the estimate of the traffic going directly

Ibid., 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 410-422. Other regulations soon followed. *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1863, p. 200 ff. *House of representatives executive documents*, 38 congress, 2 session, 7: no. 3; *ibid.*, 39 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3; Collins, *Historical sketches of Kentucky*, 1: 124.

[31] *House of representatives executive documents*, 39 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 334.

[32] *Ibid.*, 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 411.

[33] *Ibid.*, 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 412.

[34] *House reports of committees*, 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 65, *passim*.

[35] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies*, first series, 39: part 2: 22; *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1864, p. 190.

[36] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, 4: 3324.

to the confederacy was $500,000 a day. River steamers became more bold in their miserable traffic. In one instance a steamer ferried a confederate battery across the Mississippi and was rewarded with $2,000 in gold.[37]

The first clear expression of the federal trade policy for commerce beyond the lines of military occupation came in January, 1864, through rules promulgated by the secretary of the treasury and approved by President Lincoln. Besides serving other purposes, it was an adroit move to influence the population back of the confederate lines. Any person in the confederacy who would bring his products to the federal lines and take an oath of loyalty might receive twenty-five per cent of the value in "notes of the United States or Treasury notes," and a receipt for the remainder, which in the meantime would be deposited in the federal treasury; and if at the end of the war the owner could prove his consistent and continued loyalty, he might receive the balance.[38] This rift in the policy greatly augmented the fraudulent trade carried on through the trade districts. The federal commander at Memphis said, "The past and present system of trade has given strength to the rebel army, while it has demoralized and weakened our own."[39]

Finally, the whole farce of the regulation of trade as it was being carried out would have been ridiculous had it not been fraught with such serious possibilities. Colonel L. C. Baker said, "Probably never in the world's history, were the opportunities so many and great for speculation as during the secession war, nor more extensive operations than in the 'land of cotton' through the permits granted for traffic in the staple of the South."[40] Congress took up the discussion in the summer of 1864, and made discoveries that were appalling. A member

[37] *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1864, p. 190. Attempts were later made to close the lines at Memphis (May 10, 1864). *Ibid.; The rebellion record: a diary of American events with documents, narratives, illustrative incidents, poetry, etc.,* edited by Frank Moore . . . *with an introductory address on the causes of the struggle, and the great issues before the country,* by Edward Everett (New York, 1866), 11: 481.

[38] *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1864, p. 190; *House of representatives executive documents,* 39 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 330, 331; *Merchants' magazine and commercial review,* 40: 242.

[39] *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1864, p. 190.

[40] Baker, *History of the United States secret service,* 335.

of the committee on commerce investigating the conditions feared to make public the findings, stating that "if I were to mention the facts, they would make the cheeks of every American Senator tingle with shame." Continuing, he said, "Under the permission to trade, supplies have not only gone in, but bullets and powder, instruments of death which our heroic soldiers have been compelled to face and meet upon almost every field of battle in which they have been engaged in the South."[41]

A new law was passed on July 2, 1864, taking away the power of the president to grant permits which had been given in the act of July 13, 1861.[42] The intention of congress was to stop completely the commerce between the United States and the confederacy. The private trader was to be eliminated and all commerce that was necessary in the occupied districts was to be under government agents. But instead of cutting off trade, it threw it wide open. The first intimation came with the promulgation on September 24 by the secretary of the treasury, Fessenden, of a set of rules approved by Lincoln on the same day, allowing any person whatsoever who owned products in the confederate lines (the presumption being that they would be confederates) to bring them in to a government agency and receive three-fourths of their market value in New York in greenbacks. This completely nullified the law as congress intended it. The amazement of the senate was almost without bounds when, on examining more closely the measure, it found that section eight clearly warranted the new rules. Many senators believed that the section had been inserted fraudulently. This was not the case, however; the secretary of the treasury was responsible for its wording, and congress had swallowed it without knowing fully its contents.

This was not all. The senate was left little less than dumbfounded when it discovered that according to an executive order of September 24 goods to one-third the value of goods brought out might be taken through the lines directly into the confederacy.[43] Fessenden was called upon for an explanation.

[41] *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, 2: 2823.

[42] *House of representatives executive documents*, 38 congress, 2 session, 7: no. 3: 342-345; *American annual cyclopaedia*, 1865, p. 184; *House reports*, 46 congress, 1 and 2 sessions, 3: 618: 1-11.

[43] *House of representatives executive documents*, 38 congress, 1 session, 7: no. 3: 348, 349. *Congressional globe*, 38 congress, 1 session, 1: 271, 272.

His reply showed that he was either grossly misinformed in one of the most important fields of his duties, or that he was sidestepping the issue in a consummate fashion. Technically speaking, an executive order is not a treasury order, but he came perilously close to showing profound ignorance, if not mendacity, when he said, "nor have other or additional instructions affecting this point [taking goods into the confederacy] been given to any of the agents of this department."[44]

Under this wide-open policy the most amazing transactions took place. Designed to induce the confederates to bring their products out rather than destroy them to prevent them from being confiscated, the system made it possible for speculators to slip through the lines, buy up large amounts of cotton, and reap fabulous profits.[45] Under the working of the policy, permits were actually granted to persons to go in to get the cotton. The most glaring frauds arose in the use of these permits. One, allowing 15,000 bales of cotton to be brought out, was changed to read 50,000. In another, the word Louisiana was added to enlarge the region to which the permit would apply.[46] Speculators knew no bounds. A company organized with a capital of $500,000 expected to make profits aggregating over $10,000,000.[47] Permits for "probably not less than 2,000,000 of bales" were granted to persons to operate in the Mississippi valley. At times whole military campaigns were almost nullified by dishonest traders and speculators who, in the words of General

[44] *House reports of committees,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 8.

[45] According to the confiscation act of 1862, the very products that were now being paid for were subject to confiscation. This discrepancy was excused by claiming that no cotton would be captured, as the confederates would destroy it on the approach of the union forces. This plan would at least secure the cotton, which was very badly needed.

[46] *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 29 ff. An investigating committee reported that "Contracts, certificates, and presidential orders have been materially altered and changed. It is in proof that orders of the president have been altered without his knowledge or consent." *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 2. Permits were obtained only by the more fortunate, so that the permit itself sold at fancy prices. A one-fourth interest in a permit to bring out 15,000 bales of cotton (fraudulently changed to 50,000) was sold for $2,000. *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 38; *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 2 session, 1350. See also 8 Wallace, 185.

[47] *House reports of committees,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 17, 18, 65. Another company was organized with a capital of $5,000,000 to engage in the Mississippi valley trade. H. A. Risley, a high treasury official, laid himself open to grave charges in his use of permits. *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 2 ff.

Canby, "follow in the track of the army, traffic in its blood, and barter the cause for which it is fighting, with all the baseness of Judas Iscariot, but without his remorse."[48] He claimed that speculators had a prospective interest in every bale of cotton in the Mississippi valley, and that it was, therefore, to their interest to disrupt every movement of federal forces into the interior which might effect its capture. He claimed that confederate armies both east and west of the Mississippi had been almost completely provisioned by this trade, and that it added strength to the confederates equal at least to 50,000 men.[49]

New Orleans was an important center for this traffic. The disgraceful scramble for southern products, in the opinion of a congressional committee which investigated it, "is believed to have led to the prolongation of the war, and to have cost the country thousands of lives and millions upon millions of treasure."[50] A senator even intimated that doubtless there were senators who had their price in connection with the possibilities of this

[48] *House reports of committees,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 4.

[49] *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 3; *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1864, p. 191; *Executive documents,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 16: 2, 3; *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 2 session, 272, 1354. There was a curious and baffling mix-up of the different kinds of property. In the summer of 1863, Secretary Chase divided all property into four classes: abandoned, captured, commercial, and confiscable, with a different procedure and set of rules applying to each. "Commercial property is that which had been or may be sold and purchased under the license of the President, through permits granted by the officers of the Treasury Department." *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1863, p. 197. Often the army would capture property and turn it over to the quartermaster's department. The treasury would claim it as abandoned property, and presently a private speculator would lay claim to it as being covered by some contract or permit of his, and too often would get it. *House reports of committees,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 74.

[50] The report read in part: "It is the judgment of your Committee that the trade which has been carried on with the insurrectionary States since the breaking out of the rebellion, apparently sanctioned under the sanction of law, has been of no real benefit to our government; but on the other hand, has inflicted very great injury upon the public service. It has induced a spirit of speculation and plunder among the people, who have entered into a disgraceful scramble for wealth during a time of war, and has fed the greed of gain which must wound the public morals. It has tended to the demoralization and corruption of the army and navy by the exhibition of the vast rewards which have accrued from this trade and from the temptation and bribery with which they have been constantly assailed." The committee concludes "that it is of no earthly service to the United States, but an irreparable injury, and that it does but little if any good to the inhabitants for whose benefit, to a certain extent, it has been authorized." *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 1, 2, 4.

trade.[51] Business morality reached a very low ebb. A person who had watched what was taking place said, "I do not believe there is an honest man on the Mississippi river connected with cotton permits in any way; the temptations are so great they cannot withstand it. As honest men as you can find in the country go down there and become contaminated."[52] It would have been almost a miracle if of the host of treasury officials some had not been found dishonest; but the facts seem to indicate that it was almost a miracle to find one that was honest. Rear-Admiral D. D. Porter said, "a greater pack of knaves never went unhung," and declared that the whole prospect was like setting the rats to watch the cheese to see that the mice didn't get it.[53]

Opportunities for engaging in this highly speculative and remunerative trade came to the soldiers and sailors and were irresistible. The army in the west under Grant early ran into the cotton region. The service began to show immediately the evil effects of the trading that sprang up. Upon entering Tuscumbia, Alabama, army officers seized more than $2,000,000 worth of cotton and divided the proceeds.[54] Grant and Sherman soon put a stop to the further trading by soldiers, and with many other army officers began a campaign against trading at all by anyone. Sherman summed up his position by saying, "We cannot carry on war and trade with a people at the same time."[55] There was

[51] Senator Collamer said a speculator could afford to bribe every senator with $100,000 and pay $1,000,000 to each engrossing secretary. *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 2 session, 273.

[52] *House reports of committees,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24:121.

[53] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 31: part 1: 780, 781. A senator said of these treasury officials, "Taken as a class in their offices they are the most pestiferous set connected with the Government, the most obnoxious to justice and the most injurious to us as a people." *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 2 session, 274. The secretary of the treasury put up a tame defense for his officials. Secretary Chase claimed that only persons "of known intelligence and probity" had been appointed. *House of representatives executive documents,* 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 23. Secretary McCulloch, later, claimed charges of corruption were "generally instigated by malice or disappointed cupidity." *House of representatives executive documents,* 39 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 40.

[54] *Congressional globe,* 37 congress, 3 session, 62, 63, 1330-1335, 1428.

[55] At the beginning of the war some thought as a matter of course that all trade would be completely sealed with the south, and that in this a great weapon would be effectively used. Late in 1861, an observer remarked "It is easy to see the situation of the States on the Mississippi must soon be deplorable if Cairo and New Orleans

much ill-will between the army and the treasury department over this subject.[56] Conditions were most aggravated in the case of the navy. According to the interpretation of international law concerning naval captures, prizes might be taken wherever found. As a result the federal gunboats in the Mississippi valley began to operate with the main object of capturing cotton. "Naval wagon trains" as they were called, a sort of land fleet, would scour the country from ten to fifteen miles back of the rivers and bring in large amounts of cotton which would be divided as lawful naval prize. Many officers grew rich. Senator Chandler claimed that more than $100,000,000 was realized by western gunboat crews in this manner.[57] The law of July 2,

continue to be blockaded. The advance of our forces is all that can save them from starvation, if one-half told here is true." *Cincinnati Daily Commercial,* December 10, 1861. Grant was particularly bitter against the policy of allowing trade. He said, "I regard a mercenary pretended Union trader within the lines of our army as more dangerous than the shrewdest spy." *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 24: part 3: 119. Again, "My experience in West Tennessee has convinced me that any trade whatever with the rebellious States is weakening to us of at least 33 per cent. of our force. No matter what the restrictions thrown around trade, if any whatever is allowed it will be made the means of supplying to the enemy all they want. Restrictions, if lived up to, make trade unprofitable, and hence none but dishonest men go into it. I will venture that no honest man has made money in West Tennessee in the last year, whilst many fortunes have been made there during the time." *Ibid.,* first series, 24: part 3: 538. A naval commander characterized the trade atmosphere of the whole Mississippi valley as "reeking with a corruption more pestilential and fatal than the malaria of its swamps. . . In trade, at least, the dull quiet of annihilation is preferable to the baleful activity that springs from fermenting and festering decay of all the higher and more noble elements of commercial life." *Ibid.,* first series, 39: part 2: 267; see also *ibid.,* first series, 33: part 3: 150.

[56] The army was not to interfere with the treasury regulations "unless under some imperative military necessity"; but it was to help carry out the rules to such extent as "can be given without manifest injury to the public service." *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1863, p. 196. A witness testified as to the army's reverence for authority, "The officers in command down there [Memphis] do not regard the laws of Congress, the regulations of the Treasury, nor the orders of the President. . ." *House reports of committees,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 110.

[57] *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 2 session, 1351; 38 congress, 1 session, 3: 2821. Senator Chandler continued, "As I understand it, the Navy first began stealing cotton, and stole very largely — many million dollars' worth. Then the army came in and seized cotton, and there came a controversy between the Army and Navy; and finally we passed a law prohibiting both the army and the navy from touching cotton, and placing this matter in the hands of the Treasury agents." *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, 1349. Senator Ten Eyck said that not only were treasury agents dishonest, "but men engaged in carrying our flag, not only upon land but upon the

1864, put an end to this practice, by declaring that no property taken on the inland waters should be considered maritime prize.[58]

The treasury department unwittingly worked to bring about just this loose state of affairs. The secretary believed that through the interposing of the government between the trader and the market the treasury would secure a large amount of revenue. It is estimated that the treasury actually realized about $1,500,000 from its trade policy.[59]

The treasury, influenced by powerful private industries, clung to the idea that a continuance of this trade was worth more as an economic advantage to the north than its stoppage would amount to as a military weapon against the south.[60] As has been suggested, whole military campaigns were, to use the words of a senator, "directed more with a view to carry on trade and to procure the productions of the southern country than to strike down the rebels and put rebels under their feet."[61] Senator Grimes demanded that the government either "carry on this war as a war, or let us else disband the army and let the treasury undertake to trade us through the war."[62] Senator Collamer facetiously suggested that the government "withdraw all your Army, and enlist a large force of Yankee peddlers . . . to

internal waters" have been debauched by this trade, and he feared that "under plea of maritime capture raids have been set on foot, extending inland many miles." *Ibid.*, 38 congress, 1 session, 3: 2823.

[58] *House executive documents,* 38 congress, 2 session, 7: no. 3: 343. There was much opposition to this clause (section 7) in the debate in the senate. *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 2 session, 349, *passim.* See also *House executive documents,* 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 436-439; *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1863, p. 196.

[59] *House of representatives executive documents,* 39 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 39; *ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, 7: no. 3: 27; *ibid.,* 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 23; *House reports of committees,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 74, 202.

[60] A. A. Low, president of the New York chamber of commerce, said, "When barriers are erected against that trade; when free course from their sources to their mouth is interrupted, the spirit of commerce dictates that these barriers shall be removed." *Merchants' magazine and commercial review,* 48: 454; 44: 787; *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 1 session, 3: 2823. Secretary Fessenden said, "Whether the hopes which may have been indulged of a considerable revenue to the government from this source [trade policy] are realized or not, the incidental advantage of getting to market a reasonable supply of the products referred to would compensate any effort made by government in that direction." *House of representatives executive documents,* 38 congress, 2 session, 7: no. 3: 27; *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 2 session, 1352.

[61] *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 1 session, 3: 2823.

[62] *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, 2: 1352.

go down there and trade them all out; clean them out in trade."[63] Among the laxities of the trade policy may also be mentioned the entrance of much gold and good United States securities into the hands of the confederates who established large credit balances in Europe on them.[64] The question of what should be considered contraband of war was never settled satisfactorily for all concerned. The treasury had its list, the army had its list, and each private trader had his list.[65] Space does not permit a discussion here of the bearing of the confederate trade policy upon the general conditions.[66] As the confederacy fell to pieces, the trade restrictions were removed by degrees until on Septem-

[63] *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 2 session, 2: 1354. Senator Collamer also said, "It seems to me that it is an utter mistake to attempt to hold illicit intercourse with our enemies, bribed to it by the value of their products which we want. It is an exceeding unnatural connection — a love of money on one side and a pretended patriotism on the other." *Ibid.,* 38 congress, 2 session, 1: 273. Late in 1862 Grant had advocated the government's putting a stop to all trade troubles by buying all cotton at a fixed price; "then all traders (they are a curse to the army) might be expelled." *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 17: part 2: 422.

[64] The policy was constantly changing. At times gold was allowed to pass through the lines, and the secretary of the treasury defended the action by claiming that gold could be of no more use to the confederates than the cotton that was being exchanged for it. Sherman and Grant were particularly bitter against this policy. For further facts see *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1862, p. 227; *Congressional globe,* 38 congress, 2 session, 1: 273; *Merchants' magazine and commercial review,* 48: 411; *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 17: part 2: 123, 140, 155, 186; third series, 2: 350; *Senate executive documents,* 37 congress, 3 session, 1: no. 1: 268; *House of representatives executive documents,* 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 416; *ibid.,* 39 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 331.

[65] *House reports of committees,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 24: 183; *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 32: part 2: 137; *House of representatives executive documents,* 38 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 419.

[66] For the policy of the confederacy see *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1862, p. 253, 259, 264, 267; *Merchants' magazine and commercial review,* 40: 233, 234; *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* first series, 4: 532, 533, 504, 505, 450, 451; 10: part 1: 37; 17: part 2: 839; 24: part 3: 610; 26: part 2: 418, 558; 31: part 3: 744, 834; 52: part 2: 701; fourth series, 1: 111, 1077; *Executive documents,* 38 congress, 2 session, no. 16: 14, 15, 16, 22; *Statutes at large of the provisional government of the Confederate States of America from the institution of the government, February 8, 1861, to its termination, February 18, 1862, inclusive* (Richmond, 1864); James D. Richardson, *Compilation of the messages and papers of the confederacy, including the diplomatic correspondence, 1861-1865* (Nashville, 1905).

ber 1, 1865, every vestige of remaining rules was swept away and the country was again made whole, at least commercially.[67]

The federal government at no time ever had a well-balanced, unified policy regarding trade with the confederacy. There were too many departments trying to determine the proper relations and the method of their execution. This led to a maze of rules which baffled the best minds in their solution, and made possible the rise of a most reprehensible trade of immense proportions. At no time did the trade regulations for the interior approach in effectiveness the naval blockade of southern ports. In effect, the United States alone was trading with a people whose commerce was shut off from all other foreign nations. There can be but little doubt that the confederacy did get immense amounts of war material through the lines; and that the military campaigns in the Mississippi valley were at times seriously involved in and hindered by trade with the confederates.

E. Merton Coulter
Marietta College
Marietta, Ohio

[67] *War of the rebellion: a compilation of the official records of the union and confederate armies,* third series, 5: 103; first series, 43: part 2: 860; third series, 5: 103-105; *American annual cyclopaedia,* 1865, p. 185; *House of representatives executive documents,* 39 congress, 1 session, 6: no. 3: 328.

EARLY AGITATION FOR A PACIFIC RAILROAD 1845-1850

The agitation in America for a railroad to the Pacific is coincident with and a result of the opening of China to western civilization. Following the successful completion of the opium war by England, Caleb Cushing had, as a representative of the United States, succeeded in obtaining commercial concessions for his countrymen. This treaty opened five ports to the United States trade and made elaborate provisions for trade between the two countries.[1] This part of history is so well known as not to need repetition. In 1844, Asa Whitney of New York, a merchant but recently returned from China, started an agitation for a railroad to the Pacific in order to shorten the distance to Chinese ports. Whitney had first had his attention called to the importance of railroads in 1830 by riding on the Liverpool and Manchester railroad in England, when a speed was attained of thirty-four miles in forty-two minutes. Twelve years later as he was on his way to China, a Singapore paper fell into his hands announcing peace. His thoughts turned to the advantages of commerce and he gradually worked out his project of a Pacific railway. He resided two years in China and investigated the possibility of extending its commerce.[2] On January 29, 1845, he presented, through Representative Pratt of New York, a memorial to the house of representatives in which he set forth the importance of the road and the best method of building it.[3] The memorial first called attention to the fact that all states above the Potomac were now connected with the great lakes by rivers, canals, or railroads. Across New York there was building a chain of railroads to Lake Michigan. Whitney had carefully investigated the route from Lake Michigan to the Pacific and found it practicable; the distance was 3,000 miles. If the road he advocated should be built the time from Maine to

[1] *Merchants' magazine and commercial review*, 14: 93.

[2] Memorial of Whitney, 1846, in *Senate documents*, 29 congress, 1 session, 4: no. 161.

[3] *Congressional globe*, 28 congress, 2 session, 218.

Oregon would be reduced to eight days or even less; the forces of the United States could readily be concentrated over the entire area of her territory and products could be readily exchanged from all quarters. Moreover, from the mouth of the Columbia it was but 5,600 miles to Japan, and so only about nine thousand in all from New York to China. If the railroad were built, the time to China would be shortened to thirty days whereas now the trip took from one hundred to one hundred and fifty. The shortening of the distance would be of incalculable aid to the interchange of commodities of China and the United States. But this was not all. If the road were built, a naval depot could be established on the Pacific and the United States might maintain there a navy that would dominate the Pacific, South Atlantic, and Indian oceans, and even the Chinese seas.

The only way this railroad could be built, the memorial set forth, was by a grant of public lands. Whitney had been over the route and knew that most of the land was of little value; he thought it would require a tract sixty miles wide across the continent to finance the undertaking properly. From the sale of this land the road would be built and if any land remained unsold it was to become the property of Whitney. The estimated cost of the road was $50,000,000 to which had to be added $15,000,000 for running expenses until the completed road began to pay expenses. The rates on the road would be low, and surplus money might be given to educational purposes. One of the advantages of the road would be that it would be constructed by immigrants who would thus be drawn away from congested cities and forced to work in the west. The memorial asked that congress make a survey of the route between the forty-second and the forty-fifth parallels, starting from Lake Michigan and coming out at the mouth of the Columbia. In closing the memorial adverted to the fact that by the proposed road Oregon could be definitely tied to the United States, whereas otherwise its future was uncertain.

From the committee on roads and canals came on the last day of the session a short and cautious report signed by Robert Dale Owen, chairman. The subject, it said, had been referred to the committee too late for examination. The scheme was not impracticable and the merits of it certainly deserved attention.

The committee, however, was firm in the belief that if such a railroad was ever built it must be by a grant of public land. No money should ever be granted from the treasury for such a purpose.[4]

This project of Whitney's attracted attention all over the country and at first was widely condemned as a silly and chimerical scheme.[5] Whitney, however, had no intention of resting his case on a memorial; he organized a vast system of publicity with a view to influencing people's opinions. He wrote letters to congressmen, issued addresses to the people and himself visited all parts of the union advocating his plans.[6] Soon sentiment began to crystallize for and against him. The south, at first inclined to passive favor, changed rapidly to active hostility as the project became less a chimera. The *Charleston Courier* did not mince its words: it pronounced the project a visionary scheme.[7] The *Arkansas Democrat* opposed it on grounds that summed up the southern hostility: if the project succeeded it was believed that all the far west trade would go to the lakes and New York. New Orleans was a better terminus and as it was 1,400 miles closer to the coast and the intervening country more fertile, the road might be built over that route for $5,000,000 instead of $50,000,000.[8] The *Daily Union* promised Whitney would be given a patient hearing if he would come to St. Louis, but Lake Michigan was not a proper terminal for the road.[9] In like manner spoke the *New Orleans Commercial Bulletin.*[10] The opposition of the south to a transcontinental railroad so far north was inevitable.[11] The building of such a road would mean the economic murder of the south; the western trade for which it was trying would join the Oregon trade to New York. Of all the southern papers, the *Baltimore American* was the only one to be counted as a friend of the Whitney road.[12]

[4] *Reports of the house of representatives,* 28 congress, 2 session, no. 199; *Arkansas Banner,* July 2, 1845.

[5] *Ibid.,* February 26, 1845.

[6] *Ibid.,* July 2, 1845.

[7] *Charleston Courier,* August 16, 1845.

[8] *Arkansas Democrat,* December 11, 1846.

[9] *Daily Union,* October 26, 1846.

[10] *New Orleans Commercial Bulletin,* November 13, 1846..

[11] *Charleston Courier,* January 12, 1847.

[12] *Ibid.,* January 14, 1847.

Even at the north, opinion was divided. In the summer of 1845 Douglas wrote to Whitney objecting to his plan and to the route proposed. He advised Whitney to adopt Chicago as his terminal and to take a route through Council Bluffs and South Pass. Douglas went so far as to publish his plan for a railroad in opposition to Whitney's.[13] Benton opposed the plan on the ground that the route was too far north to be kept open in the winter time.[14] The *American railroad journal* opposed it for its great cost, which it thought would be $25,000 a mile. It added the caustic comment on Whitney's enthusiasm that people could believe anything they desired.[15] A Cincinnati paper favored it and complained that people were condemning it without understanding it. Judge Douglas, it said, condemned it for three features, none of which it contained.[16] One week later it set forth the advantages of the road: the railroads from New York, Philadelphia, and Boston would arrive at Sandusky in two years, then they would continue to Prairie du Chien and join Whitney's road. Virginia and Carolina roads would be extended to Lake Erie as would also the Baltimore and Ohio. Natchez, New Orleans, and St. Louis would have branch lines. Then came the remarkable prediction that the railways of the country were bound to supplant the rivers.

In the meantime Whitney himself went west to explore in person the route of the proposed road. Before leaving he wrote a pamphlet to the people of the United States and sent it out to the newspapers asking that they publish it, which they did. This pamphlet contained a public letter on the benefits of the railroad, a copy of the memorial and a report of the committee thereon.[17] Whitney started from New York on June 2, 1845, passed through Buffalo and Detroit, and arrived in Milwaukee with fifty young men in his company drawn from the nineteen states of the union.[18] He proposed to find out by personal inspection if there was a suitable starting point on Lake Michigan between parallels forty-two and forty-five from which a road could be built through public land sixty miles in width. He

[13] *Illinois State Register*, November 1, 1849.
[14] *Arkansas Democrat*, December 11, 1846.
[15] *American railroad journal*, 19: 249.
[16] *Cist's weekly advertiser*, December 3, 1845.
[17] *Arkansas Banner*, July 2, 1845.
[18] *Northern Gazette and Galena Advertiser*, June 10, 1845.

wanted to ascertain, also, if a railroad to the Missouri was feasible and to estimate the probable sale of land and the rapidity of settlement as the road progressed.[19] From Milwaukee he went overland to the Mississippi, reaching it at Prairie du Chien. At that place he attempted to secure a guide for his further journey to the Missouri but was disappointed and consequently had to determine his own route. He passed through Fort Atkinson and from a map selected a destination on the Missouri to which he directed his steps. He reached the Missouri at "15 miles below the great bend," and five miles from the point he had selected. Here he embarked on the Missouri and with his party, reduced to seven, traveled in log canoes 750 miles down that stream. At Fort Leavenworth he took passage on the steamer John Golong and reached St. Louis on September 19, having been on the Missouri for thirty-one days.[20]

Early in 1846 Whitney returned to the attack on congress. On February 24, 1846, he sent in a second memorial on his Pacific railway. In the senate it was referred to the committee on public lands and in the house to the committee on roads and canals. This second memorial of Whitney's differed in many respects from that of a year earlier;[21] it was more definite, showing the evidences of his exploration and increased information; in it he referred to the fact that the lack of time had prevented action on his last memorial and as he had spent the intervening time in exploring and collecting information he felt sure he could now make clear the feasibility of his plan. He told how he first came to have the idea, and then gave the result of his exploration in the fall of 1845. From Lake Michigan to the Mississippi, a distance of over two hundred miles, he found that a railroad could be built with a grade of not more than twenty-five feet a mile. No timber was to be had along the route for the road but the soil was good and would support settlement. The Mississippi he had found bridgeable at Prairie du Chien. From the Mississippi to the Missouri a road could be built with a grade of twenty feet to the mile. The land was still good but there were practically no streams, nor were there rocks for bridging them. No fuel was to be had along the route, and he

[19] *Arkansas Banner*, August 13, 1845.

[20] *Ibid.*, November 12, 1845, quoting the *Public Ledger*.

[21] *Senate documents*, 29 congress, 1 session, 4: no. 161.

was confident the country would never be settled without a railroad. The Missouri was bridgeable in three places only and all these were above parallel forty-two, at the mouth of the Vermilion river, and forty-three, at the mouth of White river. On the Missouri there was no timber above Council Bluffs and very little below it. There was none above parallel forty-three, he had learned from inquiry, and none between the mountains and the Missouri. From the Missouri to South Pass there was a regular ascent of six feet a mile.[22]

Lake Michigan was the best starting point for the railroad for many reasons. It was the only place from which a route might be surveyed westward through the public lands; timber was to be had there, the country was already settled, and it had communication with the east over the lakes, canals, rivers, and railroads. Iron could be obtained from Pittsburgh by canal; from the shore of Lake Michigan a course could be run straight to South Pass; and finally, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland were all building their roads westward so that they might soon connect with this point. Even the southern roads to Memphis might easily extend their lines to connect with the same point, and so the whole union would be knit in a compact mass.

Whitney thought now that the good lands for the first seven hundred miles would produce enough to pay the cost of the road to South Pass. Let the president and senate appoint commissioners who, acting with Whitney, could give title to the settlers on the lands. Fifteen years would be required to finish the road and for twenty years after it was finished Whitney agreed to keep the road in repair at his own expense, to carry mail and United States stores free; to carry merchandise at one-half a cent a ton a mile, and under two hundred miles at one-half the price of other roads; corn would be carried at twenty cents a bushel and flour at one dollar and twenty-five cents a barrel. Passengers would be charged one-half the rate of other roads. At the end of twenty years these tolls might be revised; in the meantime the unsold lands should be held in trust. He knew that the Sioux Indians were willing to sell their lands at a low price and the railroad would prove a great benefit to

[22] Whitney had been assiduous in reading the accounts of western explorers. Much of his information, he suggests, came from Fremont.

the United States in its dealings with the Indians, inasmuch as it would keep them divided. A map accompanied the report showing the route of the proposed road, and the lines built and building in the United States at that date.

In the senate the committee on public lands to which the memorial had been referred brought in a bill on the last day of July, 1846, setting aside the land Whitney had asked for from Lake Michigan to the Pacific for the railroad.[23] This bill they accompanied with an extended report on the memorial.[24] The committee considered the report from twelve points of view. In regard to the power of congress to have the road built, the committee held that the power of congress over public lands was indisputable, no matter whether those lands were in the territories or in the states. As an evidence of the practicability of the road, the committee referred to the reports of Lewis and Clark, and those of Fremont. For the adequacy of the means sought to build the road the committee quoted Whitney's arguments and approved them. They found that the railroad would have the effect of increasing the demand for the public lands and that it would be a benefit to agriculture, manufacture, mining, and both internal and foreign commerce. It would develop the fisheries and the naval power of the United States, it would be of incalculable benefit as a means of transportation, and would build up the entire union by directing hither the trade of China, Australia, and the Pacific islands. An appendix of statistics was added to the report. From the house committee on roads and canals likewise came a favorable report; but determined opposition was encountered and the congress, being near adjournment, did nothing. Benton was particularly outspoken in his opposition.

Whatever critics might say of Whitney's sanity, no one could gainsay his perseverance. Neither the action of the Chicago convention[25] nor the non-action of congress daunted him; he kept up his agitation night and day. He had the satisfaction of seeing the whole country become interested in the idea, and the north almost unanimous for the Whitney plan. On August 28,

[23] *Merchants' magazine and commercial review,* November, 1846.

[24] *Senate documents,* 29 congress, 1 session, 9: no. 466.

[25] The Rivers and harbors convention held at Chicago July 4, 1847, had adopted resolutions condemning Whitney's plan.

1847, Congressman Pratt, who had become an enthusiastic follower of Whitney, wrote a public letter to the people of the United States advocating the railroad. He compared it to the first project, which he claimed was impracticable because it would have to be under international control.[26] But as the country grew more favorable to Whitney congress became gradually more hostile. Governor Bebb went home from the Chicago convention and sent a message to the Ohio legislature in condemnation of Whitney. His grounds were four: the plan was giving too much money and land to one person; the checks and guarantees were insufficient; the railroad was located too far north; and, finally, the roads at home needed the aid. The *Louisville Examiner* commenting on this message said, "A sensible view; Whitney asks too much just now."[27] But in the same month Rhode Island, Maine, and Connecticut sent resolutions to the senate of the United States favoring Whitney's plan.[28]

The agitation for a railroad over a southern route to the Pacific had its beginning practically in the Mexican war. Before that war the south had been cut off from access to the Pacific because Mexico extended north to parallel forty-two, and even the annexation of Texas in 1845 did not improve matters inasmuch as New Mexico and California remained Mexican. During this early period, then, the south inclined passively to approve Whitney's plan or made only slight objections to it because of its northern location. As a result of the treaty of Guadaloupe Hidalgo, however, the south in 1848 found an entirely new situation: a southern route was now open to a southern port in the Pacific. This gave rise to an ever increasing agitation for a southern road. There had, of course, been suggestions long before this from southern expansionists. In October, 1845, the *Concordia Intelligencer* had suggested a railroad from Natchez, Mississippi, across the Rio Grande at Praesidio to Mazatlan on the Gulf of Lower California; this idea had been presented to the Memphis convention and had found immediate favor with Gadsden, for whose undaunted optimism no project was too big.[29] As relations then stood with Mexico no more hope

[26] *Merchants' magazine and commercial review*, 17: 386.
[27] *Louisville Examiner*, December 25, 1847.
[28] *Congressional globe*, 30 congress, 1 session, 15, 19, 51.
[29] *DeBow's review*, 3: 475.

existed for a right of way through her territory than through Saturn and the idea bore no fruit. In June, 1847, *DeBow's review* returned to the subject with the preface that at the end of the war it was evident the United States would be able to dictate its own terms, and one of the terms might well be this right of way.[30] The road should be built through Natchez, Alexandria, San Antonio, Praesidio, Monclova, Parras, and Durango to Mazatlan. The editor gave six reasons why such a road was better than the Whitney project: it started from a point where river navigation was never interrupted, it was nine hundred miles shorter, the cost of construction would be much less, no snows or harsh elements would have to be encountered, it ran through a region habitable and inhabited and through a land whose mineral products alone would more than pay for the road. This article was followed up the next month by an article of Professor Forsbey of the University of Louisiana, on the same topic, in the course of which he severely criticized the Whitney plan as compared to this one. Whitney replied in October and the controversy excited public interest to a great degree. The Natchez plan, however, was short-lived.

With the continued progress of peace negotiations in Mexico, southern leaders turned more seriously to the question. In the senate on December 21, 1847, T. Butler King, chairman of the committee on naval affairs, wrote to Lieutenant Maury, then at the head of the United States naval observatory at Washington, for his opinion as to the practicability of running a railroad from some southern city on the Mississippi to a Pacific terminal. Calhoun, also, asked Maury for similar information. Maury replied January 10, 1848, in a letter that was destined to be widely influential in the south. He showed by elaborate astronomical data that a southern Pacific port was nearer to China than a northern one, and went on to name Monterey as his choice. For an eastern terminal he fixed upon Memphis as the nearest Mississippi port to Monterey. This road was better than Whitney's road and was better than an isthmus road inasmuch as it would be through United States territory. Maury stated, however, that he knew little of the country between the two cities,

[30] *DeBow's review*, 3: 475.

and was not wedded to the two cities named.[31] This letter introduced Memphis as a contender for the honor of being the eastern terminal for the Pacific railroad and the Memphis project became known as the "Maury plan."

The year 1848 was a busy one for Whitney. The *American railroad journal* on the first day of the year declared itself a convert to his plan[32] and essayed his defense in opposition to the scathing attacks of *De Bow's review* of July, 1847. On January 17, 1848, Felsh in the senate presented to that body[33] the third memorial from Whitney for his railroad.[34] This third memorial differed from the second as the second differed from the first. Whitney did not ask a cent of money, he said, but would make the survey himself at his own expense. He would build ten miles of the road himself and after it was built would reimburse himself from the sale of five miles of the land while the United States retained the remainder. In this manner he would build the road for the eight hundred miles that ran through the good land; when the bad lands were reached, where the sale of land along the way would not pay the cost of the road, the government should advance the money needed from its share of good lands. At the completion of the road the government should sell him all unused land. The memorial asserted that no other route was practicable and claimed that this road was better than that in Panama, Tehuantepec, or Nicaragua.

This memorial in the senate was referred to the committee on public lands and in the house to a select committee.[35] On the third of May, 1848, the house committee reported a bill for the sale of land to Whitney for the railroad.[36] The scheme, so ran the report, was a startling one at first glance. The committee thought the road could be built and the power of congress to grant the lands whether in states or territories was unquestioned. The people of the United States were divided in their opinion as to the proper route but the testimony of Fremont

[31] *Western Journal*, 1: 260. The letter to Calhoun is to be found also in *Merchants' magazine and commercial review*, 18: 592.

[32] *American railroad journal*, 21: 1.

[33] *Congressional globe*, 30 congress, 1 session, 182.

[34] *Senate miscellaneous documents*, 30 congress, 1 session, no. 28.

[35] *Congressional globe*, 30 congress, 1 session, 604.

[36] *Ibid.*, 30 congress, 1 session, 716.

seemed to make a clear case for Whitney's scheme. The committee pointed out that according to their bill the lands would be given into hands of actual settlers by the government and not by Whitney. The report was hasty and largely made up of quotations from the earlier Breeze report.[37]

But the senate committee with Borland of Arkansas as chairman was now hostile and on June 26, 1848, brought in an unfavorable report. They had found the railroad would be of incalculable benefit if built, but with the information at their command they did not see their way clear to bring in a bill in favor of Whitney. Instead they reported a bill for the secretary of war to survey one or more routes for a Pacific railway below the Falls of St. Anthony.[38] This killed the plan as far as the senate was concerned. Niles next day introduced a bill to sell land to Whitney, had it referred to a select committee with himself as chairman and on July 7, 1848, brought in a bill with certain amendments. The Niles bill was drawn in conformity with the memorial of Whitney; it provided that Whitney should choose his terminals at any points on the Pacific and select his own route in any way he pleased. The railroad was to be a six-foot gauge and was to be built of iron rails weighing sixty-four pounds to the yard. There were the land provisions for which Whitney had asked and among other things it was stipulated that the road should be begun in two years.[39] This loosely-drawn bill brought down the wrath of Senator Benton. His words were vitriolic. He denounced the entire Whitney scheme and ridiculed his exploration, saying that any survey Whitney had made had extended only from one end of the capital to the other. Against such language as this Whitney protested in a letter to Hunt's *Merchants' magazine and commercial review*, terming Benton's opposition "boisterous and unparliamentary."[40] The opposition of Benton prevented the senate from even considering the bill. In this session of congress, however, Kentucky and New Jersey sent resolutions to the senate favoring the bill. New York, Rhode Island, Maine, Connecticut, Tennessee, Georgia, Illinois, New Jersey, Ohio, Kentucky, Mary-

[37] *House reports*, 30 congress, 1 session, 3: no. 733.
[38] *Senate reports*, 30 congress, 1 session, no. 191.
[39] *American railroad journal*, 21: 674.
[40] *Merchants' magazine and commercial review*, 19: 527.

land, Vermont, Pennsylvania, and Alabama all sent resolutions to the house in favor of the bill.[41]

In the meantime the *American railroad journal* had gone over to the opposition and a workingmen's convention in New York October 29, 1848, denounced Whitney's plan as "A scheme of gigantic robbery."[42] But even these things did not discourage Whitney. The attack of Benton upon him in the senate on the occasion of the opposition to the Niles bill caused him to write a letter vindicating himself; he was bold to say that two congressional committees had favored him and eighteen state legislatures had presented resolutions for him.[43] Indeed, could a railroad have been built by resolutions, Whitney would have been free from care. The actions of the state legislatures had been almost invariably unanimous. The list as given in a Cincinnati paper consisted of Indiana, Illinois, New York, Connecticut, Vermont, Rhode Island, Georgia, Tennessee, Maine, Alabama, Maryland, New Jersey, Arkansas, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Iowa.[44]

During the year 1848 the plans of Maury and Whitney monopolized public attention, with the south coming more and more to unite on Memphis. There was one point of opposition in the south to Maury's plan and that was New Orleans. New Orleans was facing the prospect of seeing her whole trade diverted to New York and Charleston and was in a decided ill-humor.[45] She was opposed both to Whitney, whose plan would attract western trade to New York, and to Maury, whose plan would attract western trade to Charleston. It was vital to New Orleans that, losing steadily in the local west, she should in some manner reach after and secure the trade of the Pacific. Out of her dilemma it seemed to New Orleans a way was provided by the plan for a Pacific railway. The project of a railway over the isthmus of Panama was an old one. Upon the acquisition of Oregon, congress had contracted with the Pacific mail com-

[41] *Senate miscellaneous documents,* 30 congress, 1 session; *House miscellaneous documents,* 30 congress, 1 session.

[42] *American railroad journal,* 22: 645.

[43] *Merchants' magazine and commercial review,* 14: 527.

[44] *Cist's weekly advertiser,* December 27, 1848; *House reports,* 30 congress, 1 session, 3: no. 733.

[45] *DeBow's review,* 3: 100.

pany for the carrying of mails from the west coast of Panama to Oregon, and on December 11, 1848, three members of this company, W. H. Aspinwall, J. L. Stephens, and Henry Chamly, presented through Douglas a memorial to the senate asking for a twenty-year mail contract over the road they were going to build across the isthmus. They already had a charter from New Granada; they would begin building in a year, and in three years would have it completed.[46] In the senate it was referred to the committee on military affairs with Jefferson Davis as chairman; both Douglas and Benton supported it. As the southern route claimed attention, Whitney began to write letters to show its impracticability by quoting from engineers who had been over the route in the Mexican war.[47]

With the opening of the second session of the thirtieth congress the Whitney scheme again became a bone of contention. In the senate, on January 29, 1849, Niles moved to take up the Whitney bill of last session, which he said had been tabled for lack of time. Borland opposed this action and Foote of Mississippi offered an amendment that the road should go to Monterey or San Francisco.[48] In the house Pollock tried in vain to gain consideration for his bill of the previous session.[49] Nothing evidently was to be hoped for from congress, but Whitney gained a new convert in the person of Governor Floyd of Virginia, who wrote a public letter favoring the project.[50]

In the spring of 1849 Whitney wrote and had published in New York an elaborate pamphlet entitled *Project for a railroad to the Pacific* in which he set forth his criticisms of the other roads now projected, declaring their terminals impossible and their routes impracticable. The bay of San Francisco, he said, was a mud flat and would never afford shipping facilities. This pamphlet the *American whig review* noticed in July and approved. As a rule Whitney found most of his support among the whigs.

With the coming of the year 1849 the railroad agitation grew more insistent. St. Louis had long had her ambitions for the

[46] *Senate miscellaneous documents*, 30 congress, 2 session, no. 1.
[47] *American railroad journal*, 21: 773.
[48] *Congressional globe*, 30 congress, 2 session, 382.
[49] *Ibid.*, 30 congress, 2 session, 25.
[50] *Maysville Herald* (Kentucky), February 10, 1849.

terminal honors and she now actively entered the lists against Memphis, Natchez, and the Whitney terminal — wherever it should be — on Lake Michigan. Senator Benton, long a persistent opponent of a Pacific railway because of his friendship for western rivers, now became the most ardent advocate of it. He had been supporting the Panama project as a temporary route until a permanent road could be established and had been the most unsparing critic of Whitney. On February 7, 1849, he introduced into the senate a bill for a Pacific railway[51] to run from St. Louis to San Francisco and to have a branch road to the mouth of the Columbia. The expense was to be met by the sale of public lands in California, Oregon, and elsewhere. It was to be a railway wherever possible and wherever a railway was impossible a macadamized road was to be built; military stations were to be built along the way and the road — government constructed — was to be turned over to private hands when completed. Benton in introducing his bill made a long speech in its behalf which became the text for the advocates of St. Louis as a terminal, although his plan was not the only one looking toward St. Louis. His bill was referred to the committee on military affairs and was reported by Benton March 2, too late for action.[52] On February 24 there was presented to congress the memorial of Bayard for a railroad from St. Louis to the Pacific by the way of the Red and Gila rivers. A grant of land twenty-five miles wide on each side of the road was asked for. The route was to be surveyed by United States engineers and thirty days after the surveys were completed the memorialist pledged himself to deposit $50,000,000 as a security for the completion of the road. The work was to be completed in eight years; iron rails were to be used, sixty pounds to the yard; and the mails were to be carried from Mississippi to California in four days or less.[53] Another scheme emanated from Boston where a certain De Grand organized a company with a capital of $100,000,000 to build a railway from St. Louis to San Francisco. Of this amount the company was to furnish $2,000,000 and was then to have the privilege of borrowing $98,000,000 in

[51] *Congressional globe*, 30 congress, 2 session, 473.
[52] *Ibid.*, 30 *congress*, 2 session, 625.
[53] *American railroad journal*, 22: 120.

United States six per cent stock.[54] De Grand claimed as a peculiar merit of his plan that nothing except cold water should be used by his employees as a stimulant while the road was being built.[55] On February 6, 1849, P. A. Hargous and others sent a petition to congress asking that the United States make no contract with other companies for carrying the mail to the Pacific, as they had a charter from Mexico for a railroad across Tehuantepec; their surveys were already made and the railroad would be built in a short time.[56] Finally Loughborough in the pages of the *Western Journal* advocated a road from St. Louis to San Francisco via the mouth of the Kansas, forks of the Platte, Fort Laramie, South Pass, Salt Lake City, and Humboldt river.[57]

There were other routes and terminals claiming consideration but with less success in impressing public sentiment. As early as 1845 Douglas had proposed Chicago, Rock Island, Council Bluffs, and South Pass as a substitute for Whitney's route and had never changed his views. Illinois, however, in 1846 had instructed for Whitney and Douglas consequently had had his hands tied.[58] Like Benton he had in the senate advocated the Panama road as a temporary line till a permanent one could be built, but unlike Benton he wanted Chicago and not St. Louis for its eastern terminal. On January 24, 1849, seventy-seven citizens of Texas memorialized congress that the Galveston and Red river company might extend its lines to San Diego.[59]

In the short session of congress nothing was done to forward any of these movements. A memorial from John Wilkes was referred to a select committee in the house and on February 20, this committee brought in a huge report of 678 printed pages, summing up and in general disapproving all the schemes then being advocated for a railroad. It advised a joint resolution for the survey of routes by the United States.[60]

Outside congress there was waged during the summer and autumn of 1849 a vigorous and vociferous contest among the

[54] *Western Journal*, 2: 438.
[55] *Ibid.*, 3: 1.
[56] *Senate miscellaneous documents*, 30 congress, 2 session, no. 50.
[57] *Western Journal*, 2: 105.
[58] *Illinois State Register*, November 1, 1849.
[59] *Senate miscellaneous documents*, 30 congress, 2 session, no. 33.
[60] *House report*, 30 congress, 2 session, no. 145.

advocates of the different routes. Railroad meetings in Cincinnati and Columbus endorsed St. Louis.[61] In the *Western Journal* Loughborough contended for his own plan and criticized all others. A committee on publicity in St. Louis had him write a pamphlet advocating the claims of St. Louis.[62] The southern press stood mainly for Memphis; the *Charleston Mercury* urged that the Nashville road be extended on through Memphis to the Pacific.[63] The New Orleans papers continued to press the claims of an isthmus road as being better calculated to advance the interests of the Crescent city. The *Commercial Bulletin* attacked the Whitney route on the familiar grounds of lack of fuel, harsh climate, danger from Indians, and lack of trade. There was some demand for a railroad from the mouth of the Ohio; V. K. Stephenson, president of the Chattanooga and Nashville roads, advocated this,[64] saying that here was the head of navigation for first class boats in winter and that ultimately the Chattanooga and Nashville roads would extend to that point. Mobile, always hostile to Memphis, looked favorably on this idea.[65]

Out of the maelstrom of differing views and jarring interests it was not likely that any result would soon come. In this emergency the west thought of its old weapon, the industrial convention, as a method of harmonizing views and initiating action. Such a convention had been held in Memphis in 1845[66] and another — a rivers and harbors convention — at Chicago in 1847.[67] Neither of these, to be sure, had been conspicuously successful in realizing the ambitions of its promoters, but they had at least made a deep impression on the minds of western people. And so in the spring of 1849, Memphis, at the instigation of the Arkansas legislature, sent out a call for a railroad convention. This convention, postponed on account of the cholera until October, was presided over by Lieutenant Maury and in spite of

[61] *Ohio Statesman*, February 5, 1849.

[62] *Western Journal*, 2: 386.

[63] *Charleston Mercury*, April 26, 1849.

[64] *Ibid.*, June 14, 1849.

[65] *Mobile Herald*, quoted in the *Commercial Bulletin*, September 20, 1849.

[66] St. George L. Sioussat, "Memphis, the gateway of the west," in *Tennessee historical magazine*, vol. 3.

[67] Robert Fergus, *Rivers and harbors convention.*

the protests of the gulf cities summed up its deliberations in a series of resolutions declaring for a railroad from Memphis to Monterey.[68] Three days before this meeting there was called to order in St. Louis a "National railroad convention" with Stephen A. Douglas in the chair. A bitter fight developed between Douglas and Benton which resulted practically in a victory for the former, and the convention declared for a railroad from San Francisco to Council Bluffs with branch lines to Chicago, St. Louis, and Memphis.[69]

With the adjournment of these two conventions the first stage of the agitation for a Pacific railroad may be said to close. In the conflict of passions that raged around the omnibus bill, the south and even the west came to look upon railroads as matters very subordinate to sectionalism. The nationalistic spirit which had been invoked, if not displayed, by both the aforementioned conventions well nigh disappeared awhile even as an ideal. In time men came back to the railroad problem with calmer minds and began the movement of the fifties which is such a well-known part of our history.

The agitation of the forties led to no immediate result yet it was not without interest and even significance. Its importance lay in the fact that it was a beginning. In five years the ambition of a great people had become concentrated on having a railroad to the Pacific. This aspiration, obscured by the growth of sectionalism, did not grow less resolute in the next decade and when the time came for the actual building of the road, men's minds had been prepared for the undertaking by a long period of deliberation. The idea was no longer strange or the question unconsidered. It is noticeable, too, that the principal lines of the western roads today are built approximately over the routes whose relative merits formed the bone of contention from 1845-1850.

A reading of the railroad literature for this period affords many interesting glimpses of the life and thought of the time. In all the talk of building a railroad hardly a mention was made of the fact that such a road must run through lands belonging

[68] See R. S. Cotterill, "Memphis railroad convention, 1849," in *Tennessee historical magazine*, 4: 83-94, for a detailed account of this meeting.

[69] For a full account of the St. Louis convention see R. S. Cotterill, "National railroad convention in St. Louis, 1849," in *Missouri historical review*, 12: 203.

to the Indians. That this was a matter for consideration did not occur, apparently, either to promoter or advocate. The native was simply ignored. No proposition was made for organizing any part of his land as a territory preliminary to building a road over it. Suggestions were being made, of course, for organizing western territories, but they had small connection with the agitation for a railroad to the Pacific. The difference of interest between the gulf states and the upper south also makes itself evident. The strife between New Orleans and Memphis was quite as bitter as that between New Orleans and the lake cities. St. Louis no longer felt itself a southern city but was inclined to take middle ground between north and south in the economic war. Kentucky was inclined to the same course. The fight made by Chicago for consideration as a terminal might well be called a foreshadowing of what actually came to pass many decades later when this city became a meeting point of eastern and western roads. It foreshadowed, too, the great struggle for the northwest that was to have such an important bearing on the issues of the civil war. Finally, there is revealed clearly to us the stress that the democrat leaders of the day were under to harmonize their state rights theories with their advocacy of a railroad. It was out of this feeling that the Douglas plan for a railroad terminating outside of state boundaries was born and this feeling was responsible for the adoption of the idea by the St. Louis convention.

Nevertheless, in the railroad agitation of the forties one is struck most by the futility and impractical nature of the planning. The fundamental idea—Asiatic trade—can only be described by the word absurd. This trade was not then nor was it ever to be of such proportions as the enthusiasts imagined. Railroads built with it as chief objective must inevitably have gone into the hands of receivers. The other plan—that of supporting the railroad on the trade of the people who were to settle along the right of way—does more credit to the heart than to any other organ of the promoters. In fact the whole body of the commercial calculations of the promoters of this period would be overvalued if termed elementary. As we read their trade calculations it is difficult for us to believe that Whitney and Maury could have been the cool-headed successful business

men we know they were. Nor did they show themselves a whit more practical in their plans for constructing the roads. They underestimated the costs and even so dealt in figures far above the reach of the business world of their day. It is nothing short of inspiring to read how easily these men talked of millions to communities that would have been hard put to it to raise hundreds. Optimists they certainly were and had optimism been legal tender railroads would have girded both plain and desert before 1850. Perhaps the sarcastic comment of an English paper of the time may well close the story: "If, however, our friends should really get from the Mississippi to Oregon, it will be a thousand pities that they should stop there. A tubular bridge across Behring's strait would literally put a girdle round the earth — and then the predilection of American citizens might be gratified by the establishment of a perpetual circulation."[70]

Robert S. Cotterill

Western Maryland College
Westminster, Maryland

[70] *Athenaeum*, December 1, 1849.

SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE EARLY TARIFFS[1]

To one familiar with the monotonous uniformity of the prairie states of the northwest with their homogeneous population, their uniform industrial organization, and their lack of clashing sectional traditions, the diversity of the little state of South Carolina proves a revelation. It is not divided by the Appalachian system into cismontane and transmontane sections, as are the neighboring states; instead of two South Carolina has had at least four or five sections, each with its peculiar industrial organization, population, traditions, and political outlook. The principal cause for this clear-cut industrial, social, and at times political dissimilarity between the various sections of the state is to be found in its peculiar physiography and from the earliest times these geographic factors have operated decisively in shaping the history of the state.

First there was the marine belt with its very rich soil extending back from the sea for a distance varying from a few miles to possibly fifty. This became the seat of the early colonial planting aristocracy which engaged in the cultivation of indigo and rice. Immediately back of this marine belt and separating it from the upland pine belt was a zone of pine and cypress swamps sparsely filled with runaway negroes, outcasts, and wild cattle. The third zone, the upland pine, when cleared of its forests proved a rich agricultural section well adapted to the short staple cotton. In the fourth place came the sand and red clay hills varying in width from a few miles to fifty or seventy-five and although having a thin soil, yet early put to the cultivation of cotton. Lastly there was an ill-defined piedmont section with its Scotch-Irish settlers given to a diversified grain farming on a small scale. This irregular zone lay as a hinterland behind the other zones and extended along the whole North Carolina boundary except where pierced by the larger river valleys such as that of the Pedee.

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Paul, May 10, 1918.

For purposes of political action these various sections of the state tended towards a grouping into three main dynamic areas. The first was the old coastal region with its ports and commercial interests; separated from this by the negative belt of pine barrens was the cotton-raising area comprising roughly the upland pine belt and the sand and clay hills. This region was far from regular in contour, being influenced largely by the altitude suitable for cotton, by soil conditions, and especially by transportation facilities. It also might be designated as the region where the system of the large farm constantly tended to shift into the plantation system. The third section was the piedmont or "back country," a region of relatively high altitudes, broken soil, poor or no transportation facilities, and given up to the "small farm" with its characteristic domestic economy and white labor. Of course, these divisions of the state were not at every point mutually exclusive and none of the sections were completely homogeneous.

By the close of the war of 1812 the three areas found themselves in widely varying conditions. The agricultural interests of the old coastal plain were decaying, although rice and sea island cotton offered to certain limited areas a lucrative crop. But the dominating factor was the commercial interests of "the city," that is, Charleston, at that time the third seaport of the United States. The back country had become very populous, and had already won a more nearly proportional representation in the legislature. Its sturdy Scotch-Irish settlers continued their vocations as small farmers following a diversified cultivation and knowing little of the great staple, cotton. Not so in the great interior section of the state. Here cotton had captured the land and the plantation system was firmly entrenched. Cotton prices had been very high before the war of 1812, consequently land and slaves sold high. The region was prosperous and inclined to be easy-going.

In the minds of many South Carolina has always been the land of particularism or anti-nationalism, a conception which results from its attitude throughout the decades between 1830 and 1860. But South Carolina for the twenty years preceding 1830 was dominated by leaders who were strong in their devotion to the national ideal. From no other quarter did the Virginia school of state rights of the first and second decade of the

nineteenth century receive such vigorous assaults as from the leaders of the Palmetto state. McDuffie's pamphlet, *One of the people*, written in 1821, his answer to "Consolidation," was full of the most ardent sentiments in favor of a centralized government as opposed to the looser form of federal government advocated by Judge Roane and John Taylor of Caroline. In thundering periods McDuffie laid the whole charge of stirring up dissension at the door of "ambitious men of inferior talents," men, who, hopeless of a national career, wished to exalt the states, "the theatres on which they expect to acquire distinction."[2]

In the same year James Hamilton in a Fourth of July oration delivered in Charleston declared that their knowledge of the existence of the national government sprang more from *"its protection than its restraints."*[3] In 1831 Langdon Cheves, speaking of the earlier nationalistic tendency of his state, declared "there was a time when we adopted much too liberal and enlarged a construction of its [the national government's] powers, but oppression has made us wiser."[4]

If one seeks an explanation of the early nationalist attitude of South Carolina after the war of 1812, one need not go far. The state found itself at the close of the war in a very enviable situation as compared to most of its sister states. Its sons had had a prominent part in the national administration during the war, and many of the resulting policies such as the bank, the tariff of 1816, and internal improvements could well be called South Carolina measures. By these agencies its patriotic sons hoped to make substantial and real the increased national independence gained by force of arms. The Scotch-Irish of the piedmont, through their aggressive enmity to Great Britain, undoubtedly rendered such a course easy.[5]

[2] George McDuffie, *One of the people* (Charleston, 1821). The contents of this pamphlet appeared in the newspapers of South Carolina between July, 1820, and July, 1821, under the title "Natural and state rights considered," in answer to a series of public letters entitled "The prospect before us . . . " signed Trio which appeared in the *Milledgeville Gazette*. This series is commonly referred to as "Consolidation."

[3] James Hamilton, *Fourth of July oration*, 1821, pamphlet in the Willis collection, Charleston, South Carolina. The author is General Hamilton of nullification renown.

[4] Langdon Cheves, *Occasional pamphlets*, 2: 1, in the same collection.

[5] McDuffie, a Scotch-Irishman, compared the American boy's hatred of England

South Carolina during the war had adopted vigorous measures to stimulate the growth of home manufactures. In August, 1812, the legislature had unanimously adopted resolutions looking toward "the improvement and advancement of domestic manufactures," and at least one establishment, the Greenville cotton factory, was given a liberal bonus.[6]

Prosperity was smiling on South Carolina during the last half of the second decade of the nineteenth century. Cotton prices were very high, the planters were consequently over-sanguine, land values and prices of slaves rose sharply, and genial content made the state inclined and able to sacrifice its more immediate material good, if necessary, for the good of the country in general.[7]

Entangled with these several causes of South Carolina nationalism was another very potent factor, national politics. It is hard to tell whether the nationalistic leaders were more actuated by their inherent ideas and ideals than by the political expediency of producing popular arguments to be used against the particularistic party affiliated with the followers of W. H. Crawford of Georgia. Under the state leadership of Senator William Smith, this state rights party in South Carolina was always formidable to the young nationals or Calhoun party. In several cases it was able to control the legislature and pledge the state to a furtherance of their doctrines. It was this particular fight that inspired McDuffie to write his glowing phrases on the blessings of a centralized government and to denounce their "high mightnesses," the state authorities, declaring that his confidence in the national government was equal to that felt in his own state.[8]

Within a decade after the close of the war of 1812, however, a great change had come in South Carolina and its statesmen. Their ardor for a centralized government had cooled decidedly.

to Hannibal's vow against the Romans. This was in his speech in the house of representatives on the bill to reduce and fix the military strength of the United States, a pamphlet edition of which was published in Charleston in 1822.

[6] Manuscript journal of the South Carolina senate, 1822 (at Columbia, South Carolina), 12: 18.

[7] Edward Stanwood, *American tariff controversies in the nineteenth century* (Boston, 1903), 1: 160.

[8] McDuffe, *One of the people.*

The causes for the transformation are many and intertwined, but they fall mainly into two categories: first, the new economic conditions into which South Carolina had gradually slipped during the decade, and secondly, the particular variety of nationalistic legislation adopted by the federal government, such as the second bank of the United States, the renewed activity in internal improvements, interference with the institution of slavery, and the definite acceptance of a protective policy.

There is no doubt that at first the second bank of the United States was popular in South Carolina. The intimate part played by Calhoun and other South Carolina leaders in congress in building the bank was at the same time both evidence and cause for such a frame of mind. The large number of Carolinians investing in stock during the first eighteen months that the subscription books were open testifies in incontrovertible terms to this fact. But soon there was a change. The records show a rapid falling off in the number of citizens holding stock and an organized effort to embarrass the bank and its Charleston branch was soon manifested, just as it had been in nearly all parts of the south and west.

The banking situation in South Carolina was unique in some respects. The state had a very complete and satisfactory state banking system, so that naturally those financially interested in the state system resented the coming of the United States bank within the state. At first there was developed considerable friction, especially over the United States bank's determination to force specie payments and a higher standard of banking ethics upon private and state banks. By the time the crisis of nullification broke, however, matters in the banking world had adjusted themselves gradually and satisfactorily to nearly all classes coming into business relations with the bank. By the late twenties and early thirties the Charleston branch was carrying a large number of planters and it was well known that its favorable exchange gave a marked advantage to the merchants trading to China, a class largely represented in Charleston. Moreover, the lenient policy as regards short-time paper was estimated to be equivalent to one-half a cent a pound to the upland cotton grower, and from one-half to two cents to the producer of sea island cotton.

Of all the many irritants presented by federal legislation to South Carolina, none proved more vital than the policy of internal improvements. South Carolina's attitude toward federal public works was largely determined by its natural features. In the first place the state was exceptionally well covered with rivers, which with slight improvements were navigable for considerable distances. In its prosperous days, South Carolina had entered eagerly upon a program of comprehensive public works, even before many of the northern states had made a move. Nearly half a generation before Gallatin drew up for President Jefferson his famous report, the old Palmetto state had chartered its Santee canal company. This company spent vast sums on a system designed to render navigable the five principal rivers of the state. Of the twenty-two districts of the state, this system of public development would have covered fourteen completely, and five more partially.

All this it might seem would have prepared South Carolina for hearty support of federal aid to internal improvements, but certain conditions conspired to prevent such a result. In the first place, although the state, especially throughout the plantation area, was remarkably favored with natural waterways and alert to the desirability of furnishing its citizens with facilities for water transportation, yet nature herself prevented an efficient waterway system. The streams were too swift and subject to too rapid rises, while the sandy character of the soil robbed the river banks of their power of resistance in times of extra strain. Furthermore, a glance at a map of the state shows how isolated South Carolina was from its sister states industrially. It demanded few things from them beyond its meat supply and draft animals, and these could be driven through the mountain passes. On the other hand, South Carolina early found the outlet for its great staple crops in Europe. Hence the domestic trade with the west and northwest was not remunerative enough to stimulate the construction of public works through the mountains, to connect the state with its neighbors. Beyond the Savannah river was a recently settled region engaged in the same kind of plantation life, offering no opportunity for mutual commerce; North Carolina ministered little to her economic wants.

Although cotton was the chief *raison d'etre* for South Carolina's earlier internal improvements enthusiasm, yet the exclusive cultivation of cotton was inimical to any general scheme, because it was a crop that could be hauled long distances in the slack time and so could not be depended upon to follow a line of public works with its incident tolls. By the time Turnhull wrote his *Crisis*, the author, realizing this isolation, could wish that nature had made the state limits a wall absolutely impassable.

By the time federal interest had become keenest in a comprehensive system of internal improvements, South Carolina had come to despair of building up its own domestic system of waterways. At the same time the state realized how its lack of commercial relations with other sections of the United States rendered futile the hope that it might share equally with the other states in the benefits of great national works. Moreover, with the development of a general hostility to the tariff, this opposition to federal public works was intensified because South Carolinians realized that such a system would tend to fasten the tariff system forever upon the country by absorbing the surplus revenue, no matter how large.

The connection between the system of internal improvements and the surplus-producing tariff was patent. Even to the South Carolina adherents of "the American system" the political leverage it afforded the national administration was not concealed. In 1828 they saw the tariff forces furnish the votes to give Ohio eight hundred thousand acres of public land as a subsidy for her canal system.[10]

This tendency to oppose the tariff because of hostility to internal improvements was soon eclipsed by the greater hatred of the tariff *per se*. The general survey bill of 1824, "authorizing the president to cause surveys to be made for such roads and canals as he deemed of national importance,"[11] received a majority of the congressional votes of the state and they came from those districts comprising the cotton section of the state where prosperity prevailed because cotton prices ruled high. It is also

[10] There is a spirited denunciation in the *Southern Patriot*, June 19, 1828.

[11] Frederick J. Turner, *Rise of the new west, 1819-1829* (*The American nation: a history*, v. 14 — New York, 1906), 232. Note especially the map showing the geographical distribution of the house vote on the bill.

to be recalled that at this time when McDuffie and Calhoun were still numbered among the nationalists, the army of particularists, led by Senator William Smith, was recruited largely from the "back-country," that is, the non-cotton-planting section.

Beginning with the Missouri question, there came a series of events that made the south fear for its peculiar institution. One of these was federal aid to the colonization society, which might involve the expropriation of public domain. Another was the clash between the national administration and South Carolina over its "native seamen act," and a third was President Adams' slave trade convention. From the first the federal control of the foreign slave trade conflicted with the interests of the slaveholders of South Carolina. A planter carrying his slaves from Georgetown to Charleston had to go to the trouble of registering them and paying a fee.[12] These things were enough to render the black belt restive even before John Randolph shocked them with the nakedness of his prophecy that the centralized government would next turn to the task of freeing the slaves. Nathaniel Macon declared that there was more chance of federal emancipation of slaves than of a comprehensive system of public works.

Possibly no other element tended more to alienate South Carolina after the war of 1812 than this sense of danger to the institution of slavery from the inevitable interference which a centralized government would be sure to offer. Intensifying this uneasiness was a factor which one is likely today to forget, the constant though perhaps vague dread of servile insurrection which hung over the south. The southern newspapers of the period studiously avoided any very explicit mention of such matters; but after the great Charleston insurrection in 1821 the succeeding decade was especially full of such fears for the whites.

The situation was not alleviated by the certain knowledge that the institution of human slavery outside America was doomed. Even before 1826 President Cooper of South Carolina college had maintained in his lectures that servile labor was more expensive to the master than free. By this time the state had come to believe that the blacks could be used only in the cul-

[12] *Charleston Courier*, September 24, 1829.

tivation of staples, thus forcing the whites to a non-industrial development. Its sensitiveness was increased by the belief that Virginia and North Carolina would prove recreant to the slave interests. Virginia's interest in the acquisition of the Texas country was frowned on by the citizens of South Carolina as a sinister scheme of Virginia to "sweep off her slaves" and then "to hoist the banner of the Free States."[13]

Insofar as the growing radicalism of the state before 1832 was based on financial depression, slavery was a contributory factor to its spread. In the four years preceding January 1, 1808, there had been entered at Charleston alone nearly forty thousand slaves who sold at high prices. The speculation both for slaves and land resulted in ruinous rates of interest which could be met only so long as cotton sold at high prices. But by the late twenties cotton had fallen and financial distress spread over the planting sections, rendering them ready for radical measures against the popular scapegoat, the tariff.

The tariff issue shows vividly the quick change from an intense nationalistic attitude to a deep and abiding sectionalism in the state. Although those Carolinians who helped build the tariff of 1816 advocated a moderate revenue rate, yet those same leaders by their speeches did not stand committed as hostile to the protection of American industries.[14] In large part as the result of the natural resentment over Great Britain's closing of the West Indian markets, a trade in which Charleston was still much interested,[15] the South Carolina planters were eager to render the cotton interests completely free from any dependence upon English mills for a market for their cotton wool. While the south as a whole cast twice as many votes against this tariff as for it, yet the most characteristically cotton state, South Carolina, reversed this ratio by registering a two to one affirmative vote.

It was not long, however, before the cotton interests came to

[13] *Charleston Courier*, September 24, 1829.

[14] Much has been written from a southern point of view to clear Lowndes and other South Carolina leaders from the imputation of ever having been other than orthodox anti-tariff men. See Harriott H. Ravenal, *Life and times of William Lowndes of South Carolina, 1782-1822* (Boston, 1901).

[15] Barnett A. Elzas, *The Jews of South Carolina from the earliest times to the present day* (Philadelphia, 1905), 177.

see that England was much more bent on getting cotton wool than on carrying out a policy of commercial discrimination against its late enemies, the Americans. As this conception swept over the state, the anti-tariff argument changed. Less was said of a depleted treasury because of prohibitory rates; new emphasis was laid upon the blessings of free trade, while the horrors of the immorality in the factory towns were painted in high colors.

By the time of the debates on the tariff of 1820, the planting sections of the state had come to see more and more clearly how little they had to fear from England's shutting out their cotton, provided that country could find a market for its exports in sufficient quantity to equalize the balance of trade.[16] Although the state as well as the entire south was almost a unit against the bill, yet there was little violent agitation or excitement in South Carolina aroused by this proposed tariff of 1820.[17]

In the light of subsequent events it is interesting to note that the two sections of the state most alive to the evils of the proposed tariff of 1820 were the coast and back country, while the great interior cotton area remained comparatively quiet. It is significant that while the South Carolina delegation in congress cast only two affirmative votes on the tariff of 1820, both came from this interior cotton producing region.

Each of these two disturbed sections, however, was actuated by a different set of motives. The chief concern of the coast, largely identified as it was with the shipping interests, was for unrestricted foreign trade because it had come to feel that the state was destined to be an exporter of a great staple which England was eager to take without discrimination even if carried in American bottoms.[18] The "upper counties," on the other hand, were aroused because they feared the federal government would be driven to direct taxes as a result of the depleted resources arising from the prohibitory rates. They also argued that the consumer would pay more for his goods and in characteristic frontier style charged the old and effete east with try-

[16] Speech of William Lowndes in *Annals of congress,* 16 congress, 1 session, 2: 1731 ff.

[17] Excluding Kentucky, there were only three southern affirmative votes. Turner, *Rise of the new west,* 144 ff.

[18] *Anti-tariff memorial of Charleston, 1820,* in Willis collection.

ing to bolster itself up in an uneven race with the new country. They declared in their petition, "It is natural for old states which have once been the seat of power to repine at the loss of their strength."[19]

The situation had changed by 1824 when South Carolina was confronted with another piece of tariff legislation.[20] But the *Southern Patriot* speaking in 1827 of this movement of 1824 said, "Then it was merely the Metropolis that petitioned — the bone and sinew of the state — the agricultural interest did not move."[21] Now there were new elements in the alignment of the tariff and anti-tariff forces. Many of these new factors were matters of personality. Judge William Smith, the former leader of the particularist forces, who had been replaced in the United States senate by R. Y. Hayne, was now in the legislature intent on building up a party of particularism against the dominant party led by the enthusiastic nationalists. To his aid came President Cooper of South Carolina college, who had actively entered the anti-tariff ranks soon after coming to the college in 1819. The Columbia memorial of 1824 against the tariff was probably his handiwork. It must be remarked, however, that despite its authorship and place of its origin — Columbia was soon to be the hotbed of radicalism — it was, when contrasted with later utterances, a conservative document, indulging in praise of the free trade policy, expressing fear lest direct taxes would result, and denouncing the tariff majority's program of "Chinese exclusion" as a system which would tend "to the anihilation of all importation," — an idea soon to be popularized into McDuffie's "forty bale" theory.

The Charleston memorial against this same tariff of 1824 illustrates the close relationship between a locality's industrial well-being and its vehemence against the aggressions of the federal government. The memorialists pointed out that "a feeling

[19] *Memorial of sundry inhabitants of upper counties of South Carolina, November 28, 1820,* in Pennsylvania historical society library.

[20] It is commonly asserted that in 1824 there began that violent anti-tariff agitation which finally resulted in nullification. Benjamin F. Perry, *Reminiscences of public men, with speeches and addresses* (Greenville, South Carolina, 1889), second series, 200, and Ulrich B. Phillips, *Georgia and state rights: a study of the political history of Georgia from the revolution to the civil war, with particular regard to federal relations* (Washington, 1902), 117.

[21] *Southern Patriot,* September 17, 1827.

of gloomy despondence was settling on the 'lower country' "— a condition far removed from the prosperous times of 1820. New ground was broken in emphasizing the unconstitutionality of such unequal legislation. There was also an ominous hint at disunion and a declaration that the "bond of union" was but a "confederacy of independent states."[22]

While the feeling against the tariff of 1824 was drastic within certain sections of the state, yet it lacked elements that three years later were to sweep the state from coast to mountains into a fever of opposition to the "woolens bill." The situation in South Carolina between the tariff agitation of 1824 and the "woolens bill" ran largely along old lines. The Adams administration was far from happy in handling the delicate points of friction. Adams neglected an easy opportunity to allay the fears of the black belt regarding his hostile attitude toward the institution of slavery.[23] Added to this was his blunder in refusing to accept England's offer to open the West Indian ports, thus fanning the fires of discontent in South Carolina. Moreover, his extreme internal improvements program with its "light houses in the skies" greatly alarmed a section now steadily becoming convinced that their peculiar institution would be safe only through the jealous preservation and extension of the powers and functions of their own state government.

With the "woolens bill" and the "tariff of abominations," the anti-tariff movement in South Carolina passed into a distinct epoch. Unlike the tariffs of 1820 and 1824, the "woolens bill" was not preceded by any continued agitation in South Carolina, but the excitement of the summer and autumn after the defeat of this bill, when it was evident that the protectionists meant to renew the struggle, made up in vehemence for the previous

[22] For the memorial see *Annals of congress*, 18 congress, 1 session, 2: 3075. This document was undoubtedly before James Hamilton when for the first time on the floor of congress he raised the question of the constitutionality of the tariff. Hamilton's idea of constitutionality is the same, that is, legislation must do more than conform to a written document — it must conform to a sense of justice. The moderation in McDuffie's speech replying to Clay in discussing the act of 1824 is more nearly typical of the state's attitude. *Ibid.*, 2: 88, 2400 ff.

[23] It is certain that the Adams administration was not planning any radical action looking toward emancipation. Turner, *Rise of the new west*, 279.

apathy, attributable probably to the unusually high prices of cotton which had lately prevailed.[24]

If the planting sections had been inclined to remain quiet between 1824 and 1827, such was not the case in the three other industrial sections, "the city," the old lowlands, and the back counties. The lowlands were in a particularly ugly temper. The prosperity of the upland cotton interests had been their undoing by drawing capital, people, and energy away from them. The inevitable decay was accentuated this season by a disaster of the principal crop, sea island cotton. The montane section, having few negroes to clothe in tariff-burdened woolens, untouched by the interests of foreign commerce and living a life of domestic economy, could have found little in the proposed legislation to influence them directly; they were opposed to it for the ordinary frontiersman's reasons: the fear that a depleted revenue would cause direct taxes and the fear that the cost of the few manufactured goods which they bought would be increased.

"The city" protested in terms familiar to the commercial interests: the danger to export trade from a restrictive policy, and the unfairness of supporting manufactures by burdening shipping. It was only natural that these hackneyed arguments should have failed to stir up any enthusiasm and that the radicals, when aroused in 1827 and 1828, should denounce Charleston for its lukewarmness.

Possibly catching their cue from the notorious sectionalism of the "woolens bill," some of the agitators proposed a program of retaliation. These proposals led from non-importation and non-consumption of tariff-aided goods to the more positive agencies of turning the sand hills into sheep runs and also of producing their own draft animals, formerly drawn from the west, a region now allied with the protection ranks.[25] This tendency to think in terms of sectional lines is brought out clearly in Calhoun's *Exposition of 1828*. A principal line of reasoning in that document was the injustice of a protective system to the planting section

[24] A corner in the English cotton market had nearly doubled the average price in 1825.

[25] See the report of the committee in 1827 in the *Southern Agriculturist*, 2: 19-22.

and upon this argument the author based his contention of the unconstitutionality of the tariff.

If another element had not entered the field, these two pieces of tariff legislation in all probability would have worked the crisis in South Carolina. But in two ways the natural development of the anti-tariff agitation was arrested or diverted. First the campaign for the presidency of the state's famous son, General Jackson, whose tariff record was sufficiently dubious, seriously complicated affairs during the summer of 1828; while after 1830 the subordination of all other programs to the radical nullification program swallowed up the tariff issue almost completely, thus approaching that later phase in which the tariff controversy can be understood only as a part of the great program of "putting the state on its sovereignty."

The region of the largest anti-tariff mass meetings reveals the sections most disturbed by the proposed legislation. Early in the summer of 1828 the parishes of the old tidewater region had poured forth a surprising array of radical protests while later in the fall, as the election approached, the upland cotton region took the lead. The McDuffie meeting at Abbeville numbered five thousand and was probably the largest political gathering ever seen in the state. Sharply contrasted with the ardent desire for radical action was the apathy of the city and back country. The position of the latter exhibits no surprising features. But so unique was the attitude of Charleston that the editor of even such a radical sheet as the *Charleston Mercury* rushed to a defense of the devotion of his fellow citizens to the peculiar interests of their state. The editor cried down all the makeshifts that had been proposed by one section and another and demanded a united effort to overthrow the entire nationalistic regime — tariff, internal improvements, and all. The argument savors of the early Jeffersonian "revolution of 1800" propaganda; and seems based on the same line of reasoning: elect Andrew Jackson to cure all our ills.

It is doubtful whether the *Charleston Mercury* expressed even approximately the spirit of Charleston. There can be no doubt that by 1828 there still remained considerable interest in the development of American manufactures. A careful survey of the press of the state in the year 1828 substantiates this. The

Charleston Courier was devoted to the protective policy and, while demonstrating that the protective duties were not in their entirety added to the consumer's cost, was at the same time urging the citizens of the state to engage in the protected interests which were adaptable to the condition of their state. Chief among these were sugar, indigo, cochineal, sheep, hemp, and cotton bagging. Such sentiments found a response in a strip of territory running diagonally across the state at the foot of the mountains. This section was ambitious of a future in manufacturing and is today the seat of the flourishing cotton mills. The *Greenville Republican*, a representative of this section, declared: "It is certain that if the effects of the tariff be to produce domestic manufactures, that Greenville is in the part of South Carolina which must become the manufacturing district." [26]

The presidential campaign of 1828 was, as has already been noted, a peculiar solvent of political lines so far as South Carolina was concerned. Many things conspired to force all factions to hide their identity in a general support of Jackson. The old Crawford-Smith-Jeffersonian state rights party had seen the course of political destiny and had come under the Jackson standard, while many conservatives seemed to see in the Jackson propaganda a palliative or at least a means of postponing any radical action by their state. On the other hand the radicals, while not enthusiastic over the beneficent effects of Jackson's election, could do nothing less than support his candidacy, although there is plenty of evidence that their leaders realized the futility of any hope for adequate redress from a change of presidents only.

Senator R. Y. Hayne represents this last class. His letters to Jackson during and immediately after the campaign are full of warm praise together with declarations of unlimited faith in the ability of the hero of New Orleans to heal South Carolina's wounds, but at the same time they are replete with adroit and insistent advice as to the future conduct of the president-elect on the troublesome issues of tariff and internal improvements.[27]

[26] *Greenville Republican*, August 9, 1828. This paper later became the *Greenville Mountaineer*, a very influential anti-nullification organ.

[27] Hayne to Jackson, June 5, 1827, and September 3, 1828, in Jackson manuscripts, library of congress.

Another type of action is seen in the conduct of James Hamilton, the most aggressive leader of the radical forces. In a letter to Jackson dated November 15, 1828, General Hamilton informs him that both the delivery and publishing of his own radical anti-tariff Walterborough speech were withheld "until I felt certain it could do no harm to your election." It seems clear that such a man as Hamilton hoped for more from Jackson than from a reëlection of Adams but that he was nevertheless in a frame of mind to demand redress for his own state. It is interesting in the light of the later nullification episode to see that Jackson never took the pains to cut the leaves of the pamphlet speech, which is still folded in the letter of its author.[28]

Efforts were made to harmonize the 1828 session of the legislature with Jackson's wishes. A. P. Hayne, a compatriot of New Orleans, proposed to visit the Hermitage and "then to visit at Columbia during the session of the Legislature." He states that others thought "it would have a good effect."[29]

If the South Carolina radicals deceived themselves into believing that Jackson's election would remove their troubles, it was not because of a lack of sharp admonition to the contrary. Thomas Player, a member of the legislature from Fairfield, in a long speech delivered during the 1828 session pointed out clearly the helplessness of the incoming administration to redress the wrongs suffered by his state. Player was not an embittered radical, even opposing in this session the calling of a convention.[30]

For the next four years, 1828 to 1832, the anti-tariff sentiment grew in South Carolina but was either overshadowed by the more absorbing issue of putting the state "on its sovereignty" in opposing the federal government or else having been taken up into that movement and having been forced to conform itself to the exigencies of a doctrinaire campaign, it lost many phases of a natural development.

A few characteristic features of the state's tariff views between 1828 and the critical stages of nullification in 1832 may, however, be distinguished. Up to the time of the "tariff of

[28] Hamilton to Jackson, November 15, 1828, Jackson papers.

[29] A. P. Hayne to Jackson, September 20, 1828, Jackson papers.

[30] Printed entire in *Columbia Telescope*, February 20, 1829.

abominations'' the one section of the state least touched by the tariff agitation had been the great short fibre cotton planting region. With the back country proverbially opposed to any program owing its inception to the lowlands, it was absolutely essential to win over the great dominant planting section before the parishes of the tidewater region could hope to control the state and command the two-thirds majority necessary to launch the state on any radical line of procedure. Whether by design or by accident, McDuffie fell upon a very efficacious slogan in the form of his ''forty bale'' theory. This classic statement of pessimism when coupled with the despair that came with falling cotton prices, high interest charges for land, and slaves bought at exorbitant prices, proved a powerful weapon to drive the state to desperate action.

The extremeness of McDuffie's position is evidenced by the action of Cardoza, editor for many years of the *Southern Patriot*, who was an authority on trade conditions as well as an economist of considerable prominence. Cardoza had opposed the tariffs of 1816, 1820, 1824, 1827, and 1828, and his arguments had been such as to suggest doubtless to McDuffie his lucidly stated ''forty bale'' theory. Cardoza had argued that destructive tariffs would ultimately tell upon the national well-being by interfering with our free exchange of commodities with the rest of the world. But by 1830 Cardoza was pointing out the fallacy in McDuffie's position while he maintained that the tariff was not to be considered a burdensome load upon the planting interests but rather a great national onus which would be discarded if once understood. Cardoza saw clearly the futility of separate action by South Carolina and feared a substantial lack of support from the shipping and agricultural interests if the issue became identified with the planting interests, especially an interest resting on the institution of slavery. By 1832 Cardoza had come to support the tariff bill of that year which the radicals were to call the worst of all tariffs up to date. It is hard to tell how far his conduct was determined by a feeling that the bill of 1832 worked real reduction and to what extent he was actuated by antipathy to nullification and the nullifiers.

One who follows the growth of radicalism in South Carolina from 1828 to 1832 will soon realize that although the tariff was

the avowed bone of contention, yet the excess of feeling was not proportional to the aggressions of the tariff forces nor to the conviction on the part of the citizenship of South Carolina of its economic injustice. The explanation is to be found in another series of events that rushed the majority party of the state into conflict with the federal authorities. But this portrayal belongs rather to a discussion of nullification than to the history of South Carolina's attitude toward the tariff.

It was an interesting development which took place to change the two to one majority of 1828 against radical action into a two to one majority sufficient to call the convention which nullified the federal tariff laws in 1832. Among the most important of the agencies bringing this to pass was the decision, somewhat unexpectedly announced, that President Jackson would ignore his preëlection promise and stand for a second term. Up to this time men like McDuffie had seemingly found ground for hope that the tariff was to be gradually undermined. An auspicious start had been made with many articles having a wide consumption in the planting states, and Jackson's veto of government aid to the Maysville road project in May, 1830, offered even more hope to the anti-tariff forces.[31] But a second term would necessitate the placating of the protective interests of Pennsylvania. Again, the open breach between the president and the vice-president influenced the trend of radicalism in their native state, although in an opposite direction from that which is commonly supposed. The determining factor was the decision of the leaders to keep Calhoun's political ambitions completely separate from the destinies of their program. In this light the crisis afforded by the rabid speech of McDuffie May 19, 1831, on the occasion of a dinner given in his honor by Hamilton in Charleston, assumes a new meaning.

The subordination of the tariff question to the more pressing one of nullification is evidenced clearly in the attempts of the former adherents of the protective principle to enter a protest against the tariff aggressions and thus weaken the charge of

[31] See Ritchie's account of his interview with McDuffie, who was returning from the session of congress. *John P. Branch historical papers of Randolph-Macon college*, no. 2: 147. On the Maysville turnpike project to which the government was asked to subscribe $150,000 for stock, see Turner, *Rise of the new west*, 139-145.

their opponents that they were lacking in loyalty to their native state. Again those representatives in congress who were hoping and working for an amelioration of tariff burdens were freely charging that the radicals, especially those of South Carolina, were doing their best to defeat improvements in order to get a chance to try their remedy of nullification, which was expected by its friends to strike down once for all the author of all their woes.[32]

JOHN L. CONGER

KNOX COLLEGE
GALESBURG, ILLINOIS

[32] William Drayton to Joes R. Poinsett, January 23, 1832, April 13, 1832, Poinsett manuscripts, in Pennsylvania historical society library; see also letter of Cambreling to Poinsett, January 23, 1832, in the same collection.

RELIGIOUS FORCES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1815-1830[1]

The influence of religion upon the development of American political and social institutions has ever commanded attention from foreign visitors to the United States. This was especially true during the early part of the nineteenth century while the European mind was still in doubt as to the feasibility of effecting complete separation of church and state. The progress of the American experiment, therefore, was watched with interest as well by political as by religious thinkers. The subject naturally was treated in greater detail by religious writers who were specifically concerned with the ecclesiastical aspect, but whatever the point of view, whether religious or political, it seemed apparent to all that conditions existing in the United States at that time were peculiarly favorable to the development of a new religious ideal. De Tocqueville, for instance, commented at length as Tench Coxe had done a generation before upon the merits of the American system which left the religious organization immune from state interference. Montalembert, speaking in the French chamber, assured his colleagues that no evils had resulted from the separation of church and state. By the middle of the century the Reverend Philip Schaff went so far as to predict that America would prove "to be the Phenix grave, not only of all European nationalities — but also of all churches and sects," and that "out of the mutual conflict of all something wholly new will [would] arise." At the close of the century a French critic, noting the characteristics which differentiate "American religion" from the religion of European countries, implied that this mid-century prediction has been fulfilled. M. Henri Bargy, moreover, is frankly of the opinion that this "American religion" which he has so clearly analyzed constitutes the most original and perhaps the most valuable contribution which the United States has thus far made to civilization.

In 1900, when his words were being put into print in Paris, it

[1] This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association in St. Paul, May 9, 1918.

is not unlikely that a consensus of intelligent opinion in the United States would have unhesitatingly repudiated the author's assumption. Some, no doubt, would have argued that since each and every religious sect is upon an equal footing in the United States there could never be evolved a characteristic or national religious faith. The generation of that day was prone to rely upon social rather than upon religious agencies for the preservation of American ideals and few would have then conceded to religion a rank higher than education among the vital forces of American life. Nevertheless the fact remains that a series of religious experiments commensurate with the political experiment in which religion has played so important a part has been slowly and gradually worked out in this country during the century of isolation which followed the second war with Great Britain. Under the peculiarly favorable conditions afforded by the United States all denominations became imbued to some extent with a common religious spirit which may very properly be designated as American. The principle of religious liberty was here for the first time put to the practical test of experience. Religious organizations of whatever faith could therefore be established upon a national basis. The mingling of many sects softened the old antagonisms and brought about mutual respect of creed. Subject alike to the operation of state and federal laws, each and every denomination might claim the equal protection of state and federal authorities. Moreover, in so far as their numbers and resources would permit, all denominations were accorded an opportunity to participate with the government in practical measures for amelioration of human ills. At the present moment, therefore, American religion in its practical manifestations has been recognized as an essential factor both in national and international affairs.

In the light of this present day recognition a study of the development of religious forces in the United States would not be out of place were it not for the extraordinary difficulties which confront the investigator. The complexity of the subject is due in part to the enormous mass of source material which has not yet been assembled. It is further enhanced by the fact that religious development has inevitably affected, as in turn it has been affected by, economic and political conditions in differ-

ent sections of the country as settlement advanced. Monographs and special studies afford little appreciable aid inasmuch as the few at present available are limited in scope, relating either to the activities of a particular religious sect or to a relatively small physiographic area. Owing to these untoward conditions, therefore, nothing more than a tentative preliminary survey can be attempted at present. The year 1815 suggests itself as a logical and convenient starting point, for by that time the distinctive features which characterize American religion of today had already taken form, and in religion as in every other phase of national development the period from 1815 to 1830 was one of rapid organization and expansion.

The principle of religious liberty, the fundamental principle of religious life, had long since been proclaimed. Enunciated first in the state constitution of Virginia and later embodied in the constitution of the United States, this principle has only gradually been made effective in the nation as a whole. In 1815 religious liberty was generally conceived as applying solely to Christian faiths, and the particular forms of Christianity then popularly approved were distinctly orthodox in creed. The fact that this was a Christian country and that its institutions were Christian institutions was accepted without question. It had, moreover, been given legal sanction in several states by constitutional provision, by legislative enactment, or by judicial decision. Anti-Christian elements were by no means aggressive except perhaps in remote regions where "Freethinkers" dwelt in small communities. Jewish congregations were so few in number that the ultimate conversion of that race was confidently expected. Organizations of national scope had already been established by five denominations. Methodist, Presbyterian, and Protestant Episcopal churches had severed their connection with ecclesiastical organizations in Great Britain during the "critical period" before the adoption of the constitution. The Catholic church about the same time obtained recognition from the vatican of its independence of every foreign jurisdiction save that of the holy see. In 1814 a Baptist national organization had been effected by the logical method of uniting local Baptist associations in a general Baptist missionary convention. The Congregational churches of New England, although without a

national association, were acting in coöperation with the Presbyterian general assembly under a "plan of union" adopted in 1801. They were, moreover, exerting a vigorous influence upon religious life through the American board of foreign missions which had been organized under Congregational influence in 1810 for the avowed purpose of concentrating the missionary activities of all protestant denominations in the United States under the direction of a missionary board having a well-defined national character. The American bible society founded in 1816 and the American Sunday-school union established in 1817 may likewise be accepted as evidence that religious organizations had responded to the national ideal. From the inadequate data available it is impossible to estimate with any degree of accuracy the relative strength of the several denominations. Yet grouping together Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Calvanistic Methodists, and Calvinistic Baptists, it is evident that at the beginning of this period protestantism in its Calvinistic form was the predominating religion in the United States. Episcopalans were confined to the seaboard, Quaker numbers had relatively declined, Catholics were still a small minority, while the lesser protestant sects had comparatively little influence outside their limited local area. This predominance of Calvinistic influence, however, was not long to remain unchallenged. The rapid settlement of the west, affording an unprecedented opportunity for religious development, furthered the growth of those sects which could best adapt their activities to the needs of a frontier population. The following decade, therefore, witnessed an almost phenomenal increase in Methodist and Baptist churches, and by 1830 the Catholic church was also prepared to claim recognition as one of the vigorous forces in American religious life.

Amid the bewildering variety of creeds and of dogma, of religious observance and of ecclesiastical polity in the United States, there was already manifest a noticeable uniformity in religious traits which all denominations tended to approximate. This tendency was in part the effect of local environment, in part the expression of commonly accepted religious ideals. In the early nineteenth century American religious experience was emphatically individualistic. The free-born American, being acquainted with many and varied forms of Christian teaching,

felt himself ever at liberty to exercise personal choice, rejecting those doctrines which he did not approve, accepting such as most nearly conformed to his own religious ideal, promulgating new doctrines, or combining old ones into a new creed which in the course of time he might hope to persuade others to accept. The average American, therefore, was wont to change his religious affiliation with an ease and frequency astonishing if not incomprehensible to the European, accustomed to regard religious belief as a permanent attribute rather than as a matter for personal choice. Change of religious affiliation, be it noted, did not necessarily imply a corresponding change of religious belief. At times the transfer of membership from one religious sect to another might be merely the casual result of circumstances, of personal ties, or of business relation. In many instances, however, it was undoubtedly the expression of a genuine emotional experience, of new-found and intense religious conviction. The emotional revival which swept through this country at the close of the eighteenth century left its indelible stamp upon an impressionable generation; and, whether in the missionary meeting of a New England college or in the less restrained atmosphere of a western camp meeting, religion made its most telling appeal through emotional preaching and found its most natural utterance in emotional expression. A new and vibrant note of individualism destined in time to modulate the tenor of American religious experience had just been uttered in New England. The Unitarians of Boston, affirming the right of each individual to submit his religious creed to the test of intellect, had asserted their own belief in the inherent dignity of man. By laying stress upon the positive idea of human worth instead of upon the negative idea of sacrifice Unitarianism gave a tremendous impetus to those humanitarian movements which have been so closely identified with American religion since that day. Emotionalism, individualism, and practical humanitarian endeavor were the distinguishing traits of American religious life in 1815.

For a generation past there had been comparatively little friction between the various religious denominations. Even between Catholic and protestant there had as yet been few misunderstandings. Intimate contact of Catholic and protestant in

the west had done much to allay the ancient prejudice of creed, while the unswerving loyalty of Maryland Catholics, who controlled the policy of their church in this country until 1815, had quieted protestant fears that Catholic influence might prove adverse to the national interests of the United States. Catholic numbers were comparatively small, and although the spirit of propaganda was full of aspiration that fact had not been apprehended by the overwhelming protestant majority. The missionary movement of the nineteenth century was then in its infancy and the great free west lay open for the expansion of each and every form of religious faith. Neither sectarian jealousy nor sectarian rivalry had been thus far deeply aroused. Yet the old antagonism, though dormant, was still alive. Inevitably it would assert itself whenever the advance of one denomination should threaten to interfere with the expansion of another, or whenever the principles and practices of a religious organization should appear to be out of harmony with the spirit of American institutions. For a number of reasons the Catholic church was peculiarly exposed to the latter accusation. In spiritual concerns it was under the immediate jurisdiction of a foreign temporal ruler. Its membership and especially its clergy were largely recruited from foreign lands. The nature of its ecclesiastical organization was an apparent contradiction to the democratic American ideal. Moreover, in two respects at least, its discipline was expressly contrary to the methods of church administration then in vogue in the United States, and at both of these points legal relations between religious organizations and the civil government might be involved.

Legal tenure of church property in the United States was one of the complex features of the American system which the European found extremely difficult to comprehend. In the eyes of the law each religious organization possessed a two-fold character. As a voluntary religious organization it was practically free from state interference. As an economic unit, however, it was a legally constituted body possessing the right to acquire property and to conduct its own financial affairs. In this latter capacity religious organizations acquired a semi-legal character and like all other incorporated bodies might claim protection of the state. In view of the fact that ecclesiastical property as

such could have no legal existence under the constitution of the United States, it was imperative that the property rights of religious associations should be regulated in exactly the same manner as the affairs of all other financial corporations, that is to say, under a charter granted by the legislative authority of the state. These charters, although not always identical in terms, ordinarily confided the administration of church property to a board of trustees elected from and by the congregation. In many instances the method of election and the obligations of the trustees were expressly stipulated in the original instrument. In the state of New York a law enacted in 1784 rigidly excluded members of the clergy from such boards; and even where no such legal restriction was imposed, it had become the accepted custom for the control of the property to be vested in the congregation. From the American point of view the right of the laity to direct the management of finances was incontestable, and in 1815 all church property in the United States whether protestant or Catholic was administered by boards of trustees in which the laity formed a controlling majority. In so far as Catholic churches followed this procedure, however, a fundamental principle of Catholic administration had been set aside. Protestant custom had been followed with hesitation and reluctance by the Catholic clergy because immediately after the revolution it had appeared to be the only possible expedient for preventing the confiscation of all ecclesiastical property by the state governments. Controversies between Catholic laity and Catholic clergy over the ownership and control of church property might therefore and in fact actually did result from the inherent contradictions of two dissimilar legal systems. After 1820, when newly-appointed Catholic bishops unfamiliar with American traditions or with American legal procedure undertook to abolish the existing system through the exercise of ecclesiastical authority, these disputes between laity and clergy became increasingly acute. In New York, New Orleans, Philadelphia, and other cities the factional strife within Catholic congregations frequently resulted in violent outbreaks which forced the civil authorities to intervene. It is not surprising that the repetition of such occurrences tended to revive the latent protestant suspicion that the discipline of the Catholic church

might be incompatible with the spirit of American institutions. Furthermore, it must be noted that this suspicion was strengthened by direct appeals from Catholic congregations to the public opinion of the community for protection against the aggressions of their own bishops. In Philadelphia a situation already tense was aggravated by the fact that the bishop who endeavored to enforce his canonical authority was not at that moment a naturalized citizen of the United States.

Another characteristic feature of church government in the United States at variance with Catholic discipline was the selection of the minister or priest by the lay members of his congregation. The minister or priest thus chosen, whether by direct vote of the congregation or by the delegated vote of the trustees, was in the last resort dependent upon the laity for his appointment to office and for the payment of his annual income. Because this practice was recognized as thoroughly consistent with American ideas of government it had been almost universally adopted. In the Methodist church on account of the custom of itineracy certain modifications were obviously necessary. In the Catholic church there was still more urgent need for adjustment on account of the inconsistency then existing between principle and practice, for owing to the dearth of priests in the United States the bishops had permitted wide latitude in this respect. Thus through the exercise of unusual privileges American Catholics of the earlier generation had become accustomed to a procedure which prelates acquainted with canon law could not be expected to approve. The reorganization of the Catholic church after 1815 brought to the United States a number of Irish bishops habituated to a more vigorous exercise of authority than Catholics in this country had previously experienced. The attempts made by these bishops to remove priests who had received appointments from boards of trustees inevitably precipitated sharp conflicts between the bishops and Catholic congregations. Conspicuous instances of lay resistance to episcopal authority occurred in New York and in Philadelphia; in each of these cases the question of clerical appointment was closely related to the control of church property. The impression made upon the general public by these disputes was most unfortunate, for controversies between Catholic laity and

Catholic clergy in regard to rights which the American point of view had accepted as inviolable were distinctly unfavorable to the continuance of harmonious relations between religious denominations. The fact that such occurrences were by no means infrequent accounts in some degree for the steady increase of sectarian antagonism after 1815.

The modification of state constitutions which was necessary in order to bring them into accord with the principle of religious liberty recognized by the federal constitution had by no means proceeded uniformly since 1789. In several states religious disqualifications of one kind or another were still imposed and, since these could not be removed without appeals to political influence and to the support of public opinion, religion inevitably became associated with local politics. In the years 1816 and 1817, state elections in Connecticut and New Hampshire respectively turned upon religious issues. The revision of state constitutions in New York and Massachusetts in 1820 led to warm debate upon the subject. In Maryland, too, there was much discussion from 1818 to 1823 while bills for the removal of religious tests were pending in the state legislature. The agitation over Catholic emancipation in Ireland, which was warmly supported in this country after 1820, added cogency to the argument in favor of bringing state constitutions into conformity with the principles of the federal government. Expediency and principle were at this point in complete accord, and by 1832 the support of an established church was discontinued even in the state of Massachusetts. The gradual removal of religious disqualifications in the older states during the period of transition thus gave to the principle of religious liberty a more extended application than had been deemed expedient or practicable by the preceding generation.

Paradoxical as it may appear, the removal of constitutional restrictions did not dissolve the tie between religious and political interests. Churches were still dependent upon state legislatures for grants or modifications of charters, for authority to conduct educational and charitable institutions, to control church property, to raise funds by means of lotteries, or other extraordinary measures. Special legislative concessions were indispensable whenever the peculiar tenets of a religious sect for-

bade conformity with ordinary state regulations. Quakers and Mennonites, for instance, were permitted to affirm instead of taking the oath; Quakers in New York were exempt from military service; and in Louisiana the testimony of nuns could be taken out of court. Under normal conditions these concessions were granted without discussion as part of routine legislation. But if by any chance partisan feeling either political or religious were thrust into the discussion there was ever present the danger that sectarian prejudice might become blended with the rancor of political strife. Under such conditions purely local disagreements frequently led to unforeseen results. Among the numerous instances of the kind which occurred during this period one which has received attention from historians is the controversy between Presbyterian and Congregational factions in a small church near Dartmouth college. The contention, begun in 1815, soon led to a contest for the control of Dartmouth college and immediately thereafter invaded the realm of state politics. During the election of 1817 practically all the dissenting sects in New Hampshire, Baptists and Methodists, Universalists and "Free-thinkers" as well as Presbyterians, were aligned in a concerted attack upon the federalist party and the established church. The faction defeated in this election then appealed to the supreme court of New Hampshire and eventually carried its case to the supreme court of the United States, whence came the famous decision upholding the rights of the original board of coöpting trustees. The decision establishing the validity of charter grants, although technically favorable to the interests of the Congregational church, produced in effect quite the opposite result. Even while Webster was delivering his eloquent appeal the opposition in New Hampshire was being consolidated, and in 1819 a combination of religious and political forces in the state legislature succeeded in withdrawing the last vestiges of political authority from the established church. In 1820 a similar contest between Unitarian and orthodox members of the Dedham church was carried to the supreme court of Massachusetts, occasioning thereby much political and religious discussion and eventually leading to the legal recognition of the Unitarian faith. An incident no less significant, although perhaps it may be less familiar, occurred about the same time in Pennsylvania.

Here also the disturbance began in a local church. In 1821 one of the contending factions in a Catholic church in Philadelphia presented an application for a modification of its charter. Reversing the order used in other states, the procedure of Pennsylvania required that appeals of this kind should be first presented to the supreme court and only in case of refusal carried to the legislature of the state. The result, however, was exactly the same. In Pennsylvania as in New Hampshire sectarian apprehensions were aroused and during the election of 1823 each of the gubernatorial candidates made open appeals to the vote of the numerous denominations within the state.

Under certain circumstances it became the duty of state or local executives to deal with problems of a sectarian nature. The local executive, for example, was bound to assert his authority in case of quarrels between religious factions which threatened to disturb the public peace. Even more imperative became the need for intervention when the property rights of religious corporations were endangered. Legal cases arising from either of these two causes were frequently brought before the state courts by the contestants and, in more than one instance, it was found that the decision of the court hinged upon the interpretation of some point in religious doctrine. Decisions involving doctrinal interpretation were usually given by the court with extreme reluctance; when possible, the religious issue was tactfully ignored. In the Dartmouth college case, for example, the religious origin of the controversy has been almost entirely forgotten. Evasion, however, was frequently impossible, and in such cases state and federal courts did not hesitate to render judicial decisions which vitally affected the interests of one or another denomination. In the course of time the precedents established by such decisions have laid the foundations of a substantial code of civil church law.

The federal government of the United States, in theory if not in fact, has no legitimate concern with any particular religious organization. In this connection, however, it must be remembered that the prohibitive clause of the first amendment applied solely to congress. It was never binding upon the executive, nor was the judiciary affected by its restrictions. Literal interpretation of this clause, it is true, would have effectually

prevented any congressional action in regard to religious matters; it was early perceived that the acquisition of a federal district had made this strict interpretation quite untenable. During the course of a debate in 1805, when the first application for a charter of incorporation was presented to congress by a religious society in the District of Columbia, the constitutional argument was promptly set aside and thereafter charters of incorporation for churches as well as for educational and charitable institutions under sectarian management were granted without question to all denominations. About 1830 it became the accepted custom that each of these charters should be accompanied by a donation of land within the District. Acts of incorporation for religious organizations of national scope such as the American bible society or the American Baptist general convention, on the contrary, were invariably refused upon grounds of constitutionality as well as of expediency. Religious questions arising in the territories of the United States likewise demanded congressional action. Congress alone possessed the authority to confirm the land grants made to Catholic churches by the French and Spanish governments, or to make fresh grants to such claimants in case the original deeds had disappeared. A precedent which might have proved embarrassing to future congresses was avoided in 1811 when the presidential veto prevented a grant of land to a Baptist congregation in Mississippi. Indirect aid, however, could still be tendered to the various religious organizations by means of land grants or direct appropriations for the support of educational and charitable institutions under sectarian control. The precedent for such grants was established in 1819 when an appropriation was made for the Connecticut asylum for the deaf and dumb. In 1826 a grant was made to a similar institution in Kentucky, and in the same year a sum of money was appropriated for the support of a college which had just been founded in the District of Columbia for the purpose of providing suitable education for Baptist missionaries. Minor favors at the command of congress were also readily accepted by the several denominations. The salary of chaplain to congress, although not large, was a substantial aid to a new and struggling church. Franking privileges facilitated the circulation of religious literature.

The remission of customs duties lowered the cost of church vestments and of altar furnishings for Catholic churches. The opportunity to preach in the halls of congress on Sunday was also welcomed since it conveyed to the denomination a gratifying sense of sectarian prestige.

The relations between the federal executive and religious organizations had been determined from the first not by constitutional limitations or restrictions but rather by a sense of fitness and propriety. Points of contact between the two had been well established even before the constitution had been adopted. The department of state, for example, had then lent its aid to facilitate the national organization of Protestant Episcopal and Catholic churches. Formal expressions of loyalty from all the larger religious denominations had been sent to the president immediately after the first inauguration. Applications or requests from religious organizations invariably received the most deferential consideration not only from the president but from the heads of executive departments as well. With the expansion of federal authority after 1815, occurring at a moment when religious organizations were likewise extending the scope of their activities, the range of contact between the two was necessarily broadened. Under these circumstances executive patronage became a matter of some concern to the agents of religious organizations who were in communication with the heads of federal executive departments. Individual members of the various denominations, therefore, were frequently called upon to use what personal influence they might possess on behalf of candidates who were in a sense the representatives of a particular form of religious faith. In certain departments this representation was especially desirable. Minor offices in the department of state were of distinct advantage to the Catholic church on account of the diplomatic complications which threatened to arise from its relation to the Roman see. The American board of foreign missions, ever watchful of the interests of its missions in the Sandwich islands, relied upon the secretary of the navy for their protection. The secretary of war was continuously in communication with agents of the various missionary societies — Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian, Methodist, Quaker, Moravian, Episcopalian, and Catholic — then coöperat-

ing with the federal government in the attempt to deal justly with the Indian problem. This practical coöperation between the government and religious societies for the furtherance of measures which the government was either unprepared or disinclined to undertake was perhaps the most significant feature of religious development during this period. Not that the idea itself was in any wise new; on the contrary, precedent had long since been established. Its prominence at this particular period may be ascribed to the fact that coöperation was then carried out upon a more extended scale than had previously been attempted. Through the conduct of enterprises in which both were deeply concerned the relations between the government and religious organizations for the first time began to assume a systematic and definite form. The dual control of Indian missions furnishes the best illustration of the system at work. After 1819 the secretary of war distributed among the various missionary organizations the annual appropriation of ten thousand dollars set apart for the civilization of the Indians. The societies then appointed the teachers and directed the management of all Indian schools. The government for its part lent official sanction to mission workers and bore a considerable portion of the expense. Missions and schools among the Indian tribes were conducted, therefore, in accord with a well-conceived coöperative plan. In sum, the federal government although having no concern with the tenets of any religious sect was nevertheless in close and intimate touch with movements directed by religious organizations. The religious organizations, on the other hand, were dependent to some extent at least upon the federal government for the protection which enabled them to carry on the work of religious expansion either in this country or in foreign lands.

During the period under review the characteristic features of American religious life became more sharply outlined and accentuated. Individualism remained throughout the dominant note. Emotionalism everywhere prevailed. The number and variety of sects was increased by the formation of new communistic societies and by schisms within the older denominations. The solidarity of the larger sects was thus indirectly strengthened by the elimination of discordant elements as well as through

the consolidation of their national organizations. At the same time the scope of religious activity was vastly enlarged; missionary societies were multiplied, schools and colleges were founded. In new communities the churches exercised both civic and social functions, caring for the poor and sick, educating the children, providing intellectual diversion and social relaxation, taking the leadership in business and local political affairs. With the growth of the religious periodical press the churches gained an additional means of directing public opinion. Religion as a force in American life thus steadily gained in influence and in weight.

Meanwhile the relative strength of the various denominations had been undergoing modification. With the opening of the west and the steady influx of an immigrant population the membership of the Methodist, Baptist, and Catholic churches rapidly increased, the largest proportional increase being in the Catholic church. Relatively if not actually the numbers of the Presbyterian, Congregational, Quaker, and Protestant Episcopal churches therefore declined. For some years longer, however, these older churches were destined to retain the social, intellectual, and moral leadership to which they had been accustomed. As a reflex of this changing proportion there was a noticeable heightening of sectarian feeling. Under the changing conditions the Catholic church in the United States found itself in a precarious situation. Its membershp and priesthood were largely foreign; its missionary funds were derived from European countries; and, as has already been pointed out, in two respects at least its canon law was in direct conflict with American custom. Moreover, dissensions within its fold invited the intervention of protestant civil officials at a moment when Catholic Europe had become identified with the political idea of absolute rule.

The potentiality of religious forces at this or at any other period of the history of the United States is too incalculable for measurement in accurate terms. Much depends upon the individual, more perhaps upon the strength of religious organization, while something must always be allowed for the effect of diverse creeds upon each other. Suffice it to conclude, therefore, that during these years of transition and expansion the

Christian religion was leaving its permanent impress upon American institutions and that before the close of the period religious organizations had come to be recognized as influential factors in the political development of the nation.

Martha L. Edwards

Lake Erie College
Painesville, Ohio

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

Letters of John Ball, 1832-1833

The letters which follow have been selected for publication from a somewhat larger number recently entrusted to me by the daughter of the writer, Miss Lucy Ball of Grandville, Michigan. Although they present no information which will add materially to our knowledge of the Wyeth Oregon expedition, the interest which attaches to that enterprise seems to render it worth while to make accessible to students the contemporary details concerning it set forth in these letters, written by a shrewd and educated participant.

John Ball was a native of Hebron, New Hampshire, born in November, 1794. His ancestors were of substantial New England stock, rich in character, although not unduly endowed with worldly goods. Rigidly puritan in their outlook upon life (it is related that for venturing to laugh on Sunday John Ball was reproved by an uncle with the warning: "For this I will bear testimony against you on the day of judgment"), their extreme religious views produced in our subject such a revulsion of feeling that through life he was an opponent of orthodoxy. In due time he entered Dartmouth college, from which, notwithstanding much financial stringency, he graduated in 1820. Apparently he had inherited a fondness for travel, a disposition which he found means to gratify even during his struggling undergraduate years. After graduation he made his home at Lansingburgh, New York, where the study and practice of law, to which he devoted himself, was interrupted by occasional journeys to distant points and finally, by a domestic tragedy which thrust upon him the administration of a sister's manufacturing establishment.

Close neighbor of the Ball family in Hebron was the Ordway family. To his ancestral acres Sergeant John Ordway returned, following the conclusion of the famous expedition of Lewis and

Clark in 1806, and the tales of wild adventure in savage lands he brought to quiet Hebron township found in the young lad, John Ball, an eager auditor. It is the daughter's impression that this influence of Sergeant Ordway upon her father in his early youth was primarily responsible for his participation, a quarter of a century later, in the Wyeth expedition. Thus another link is suggested connecting this enterprise with the earlier and more noted one of Lewis and Clark.

Ball himself relates, in his manuscript autobiography written in old age, that having been relieved of the necessity of caring for his sister's business by reason of the admission of a partner into the firm, he determined, having worked hard all his life thus far, to take a little recreation. Accordingly he applied to Nathaniel Wyeth, of whose plans for a trading venture to Oregon he had learned, for permission to join the expedition. It was given, and in the spring of 1832 Ball met the other members of the party at Baltimore, and from here continued with the expedition until its dissolution at Fort Vancouver.

For the purpose of the present publication it would seem to be unnecessary to go into an account of Wyeth's expedition. The fortunes of John Ball, after its dissolution, are worth noting, however. Stranded at Fort Vancouver, he first gained employment at his early occupation as schoolmaster, being engaged by Dr. Mcloughlin to tutor his son and the other boys around the fort. The next spring (1833) he began the task of subduing a farm in the Willamette valley; thus, he became probably the first school teacher and one of the first farmers (outside the employ of the Hudson's Bay company's employees) in Oregon. In the autumn he abandoned this project and shipped for home by way of San Francisco, the Sandwich islands, and Cape Horn. After numerous hardships and interesting adventures he finally reached Hampton Roads in the summer of 1834, having made the last leg of the journey on the ship *Boxer*, coming home from the Brazil station under the command of Lieutenant David G. Farragut. Ball's later life was passed in Michigan, to which state he came in 1836. He became a prominent citizen of the Grand river valley, and the finest park in western Michigan (at Grand Rapids) today bears his name.

M. M. Quaife

Lexington, Missouri State Ap. 29th 1832

My Dear Friend,

I arrived at this place this day, it is about 100 miles on the river above Franklin We left St. Louis on board a Steam Boat, but got but 6 or 8 miles above Jefferson when we came to a place in the river, where there could be found but 3 feet watter, our boat drawing 6. After waiting a day or two for a chanel to form I with some of my company quit the boat & have walked on for 5 days through woods, mud, creeks, & over praries, in rain & shine, all interesting. Now, to go back to Baltimore. After waiting there some time a Cap^{t} Wyeth of Cambridge Mass. arrived from Boston by water with 21 men bound to the Columbia river. I had communicated with him while at N. Y. & upon seeing him resolved to join his company, it being a mutual concern called the "Pacific Trading Co." M^{r} Wyeth furnishes the capital, & we go to establish a trade by water it being now carried on from this state to the mountains, designing to divert it to the ocean, believing it will be more profitable than even this. Houses in Boston & N. Y. have engaged to supply goods & make shipments to any amount required. But, sir, you know to see nature & learn from her, will satisfy me, alone. O how you would laugh to see my companions & my self of a evening encamped in a tent eating supper with a jack knife, we are truly a hetrogenious set Capt. an active, business man, as great philosopher as ever I met with, all learned by his own observation he goes ahead in every thing, a good hunter, will mend a gun or waggon or any thing else with a Jack Knife He has a brother with him who is surgeon & physi^{n} to the Co. who has had the first opportunity for an education, but the Cap^{t} told me frankly, he had no judgment at all, still he appears a tolerable botinist & a very clever fellow.[1] Most of the balance of the company are a hardy, rough illiterate set of fellows, mostly from or rather natives of N. H. still all very well.

We came 60 miles on a rail road: then 160 on foot over the Alegany mountains, encamped in tents every night, tho' rather cold & our fare coarse, I felt no serious inconvenience. 60 miles

[1] This was Jacob Wyeth, eldest brother of Nathaniel, a man of fifty-three years at this time. On his return from the expedition (which he abandoned before it had reached Oregon) Wyeth settled in the lead-mine region of northwestern Illinois, where the remainder of his life was passed.

from Brownsville on the Monongahela to Pittsburgh, then 1000 miles by steam boat down the Ohio & 200 up to St. Louis, then 300 to this place by see & land As to towns I can give you but little information except in this quarter. Lexington is a[s] large say a[s] *Batestown* 6 years old, and there are Fredom in Jackson & Liberty in Clay Counties about 50 miles above, these Co^{s} are frontier. The Mormonites in Jackson Co. This open part of the State is considerably settled being exclent land mostly prarie, & setled mostly from nigh Ken. Ten. & Va, many slaves. I walked yesterday 30 miles over a prarie, & altho' somewhat roling, it has an appearance of vastness like the Ocean the river botoms are wooded, as also the hills extending some few miles back. the bottoms are scirted by lime stone bluffs, then broken for a few miles as I said. There is much cotton wood on the river banks & islands & the moment new ones are formed it springs up like grass, & you may determine the age of the islands by the groth. the cotton wood you are probably aware is a kind of *popular*. There is a rich field for botany, vegitation begining to put out fairly, tho' not as forward as I expected, the season they say is late, the grass on the praries is from 6 to 12 inc. high, but where it has been burned over as most of it is not thick, still fine herds of 100 hed grazing. Still there is not a good supply of good water, nor should I think from the countinance of people that it was very healthy.

There has no subject interested me more, than geology,[2] commencing at Baltimore, the primitive forms a low range for some miles back, & on the rail road the strata & alternations are plainly seen. The transision among which is the Breccia of which the pillars in the capitol are formed, the Blue ridge is first grawake, then the extensive valey in which is the Shandoak of lime stone, then the hundred ridges of the Alegany for more than a hundred miles & on our rout almost entirely of the grawakes. Just before you reach the highest ridge a few miles west of the commencement of the National road you will find coal, *bituminous*, above & below it, is a light gray sand stone, I suppose 3 grawake. the coal is found in the deep valies of the Allegany high on the banks of the Monongahela & upper parts of the

[2] After his return to the United States Ball wrote for *Silliman's journal* an article on the geography and geology of the region he had traversed.

Ohio, then sinks, till it disappears under the bed before you reach Cincinati & the country is covered with shell lime stones, but the coal again appears on the Missouri below the place where I now am, tho' the strata is not so thick as at Pittsburgh, being there 6 or 8 f^t^ & here 1½. the praries are a *black muck.* The bed of the river a quick sand & mixed with soil, the water the colour of well creamed coffee, when you drink & shut your mouth you feel the grit, but thus it eternally flows at 5 knots per hour. Now we are to fit out, forthwith, for good, obtain 40 or 50 horses to carry our good & ourselves a part of the time, & launch off on to a prarie on the south of the river, that ends at the mountains. the distance is reconed from 1 to 2000 miles by the hunters, but doubtless much exagerated. They here know more of the mountains & Santa Fee than N. Y. & N. England. Say there is danger without System & care but little with them. Our party goes with one of 60 of a M^r^ Sublette, a well known trader to the head waters of the Louis [Lewis] river, he is the best guide in the country.

I will write to you or some one else & let you know if there is any way that I can receive news from you & in fact the world for I have heard nothing from E. of the mountains since I crost them. And I cannot endure the thought that I am not to hear from you & others for years. But be assured that is the only subject that disturbes me at all in my undertaking, receive my warmest love & give the same especialy to your family, and also to all who enquire.

Your friend

D^r^ T. C. Brinsmade John Ball

A John Ball To D^r^ Brinsmade Recd May 22. 1832 Lexington, Missouri

Addressed D^r^ T. C. Brinsmade Lansingburgh, N. Y.

Liberty, Missouri, May 1^st^ 1832

Dear Brother,

15 miles more, would carry me fairly beyond civilization, for it is but that distance to the bounds of this State. Here we finally fit out for the Columbia, & expect to be on our way in a very few days. I say we, not recollecting that I have not informed you of my plans. At one time I expected a large number of persons to go for the purpose of making a settlement, but

it proved to be a plan started by a set of men or rather an individual in Boston who has not as yet made his plans hear. A M[r] Wyeth of Cambridge Mass. formed the plan of going out with a company for the purpose of trade or at least to explore the country & see if a settlement could be made & business carried on to advantage. He puts in the necessary capitol for the commencement, & men in Boston & New York have engaged to send goods & ships around Cape Horn to any extent necessary, & bring back such cargoes as we may collect. Fur is the usual article of trade, but could we find a market, Salmon can be caught in immense quantities, also lumber made for the Sandwich islands or any other place where there should be a demand in the Pacific ocean. 22 men came on with M[r] Wyeth by water from Boston to Baltimore, where 4 others joined them & 2 since, so that we have now 28 at least one half of them natives of N. H. It is a partnership, and the Company called the "Pacific Trading Co." and intend to go into any business that may present a fair prospect, & make a settlement if best.

My dear friends, be not surprised when I tell you I have no very peculiar feeling on account of the distance I am from you, for thought, you know, do'nt mind that, and it will be the same probably when twice the distance, if I can get that far. Still you cannot overrate my desire to have your company to see all the interesting objects on my rout. This is a very fine country, & I have walked within a week 152 miles, we having left St. Louis in a Steam Boat, but came to a part of the Missouri where there was but 3 feet water & while they were lightning & getting along we have come on. I walked yesterday 35 miles without fatigue, so you see I am becoming used to this kind of work. We are however to have horses to carry our goods & to ride at least a part of the way. In a few miles, we enter on a prarie that extends to the mountains. I have already been many miles on praries of the roling kind, being extensive swells with occasionally a run of water. The grass is a foot high, but does not at first spring up thick from the burnt ground. Many cattle & horses, oxen $10. horses $30. a head, the soil very furtile, still their crops of corn were cut off by the frost last year, peach killed last winter, & the ground actually frose last night but no damage done. There is no doubt the weather is more changable

here than with you & the extreem greater. Some winters cattle live finely, in others they die. West of the mountains they say the climate is better, we will see, & if so it will be of no small consideration. I will write again a[nd] let you know if there is any way that letters would probably reach me, for I am by no means ready to make up my mind not to hear from you again for a long time. Understand I do not know but I may be back soon, at any rate rather expect to see you all again. And should I not may you not be any less happy on account of my absence. Nathaniel what is your health, I am thinking this journey would suit you, they say the hunters are never sick, & their food so simple that when they meet with any accident, they soon recover. The danger of our rout is not thought great, still constant care is required, and we are to have the company of a M[r] Sublette with sixty men to the waters of the Louis river, where he has a traping company, he understands the country better than any other man, having often been to the mountains & to Santa Fee. There are not less than 5 or 600 men starting at this time for the mountains, where the trade is constantly carried on from this state, but none of them go to the Pacific, & we think if we could furnish them from that sourse it will be better, the distance not being half so great, and the grand range of the rocky mountains being the great fur country especially for the beaver. But gain you are aware is not my only inducement, it is to see & learn. As to fatigue & privation I have no serious apprehensions I have already slept on the floor with my portmanto for a pillow, on the deck of a steam boat, in tent on straw, eaten once twice & three times a day, have felt no inconvenience as yet & was never better in spirits &c. still it will doubtless be harder I shall as often as possible let you know how I fare. I wrote to father & mother from St Louis, give them my best love & all others. Lewis I will look you out a farm, and a good likely young indian husband for you Mary Oh Sarah while in Baltimore who should I meet but Parker I tell you, we had a warm shaking of hands, his wife was there & I was introduced to her & found her as fine a woman as I have lat[e]ly seen, she is rather thin & appears of a lively turn, they had been to Philadelphia to see her father who was sick,

but better. I saw them but a little while & they went off home on the rail road, I could not call to see them.

Now you see I have quit the law & oil cloth business, & think I shall never regret the same. About the matters at Lansingburgh I do not know that Mrs. Ferrin, or any of you, ought to be very unhappy, it is all in the course of human events, and according to human nature. I thought best thus for to express my feelings. My love & good will again, good by, hoping to enjoy This Tour

(your brother & Uncle

John Ball

No 1st from John Ball Liberty Missouri May 1st 1832
Addressed: Mr Nathaniel Ball Junior, Hebron, N. H.

13th July 1832

Dear father & mother,

with joy I write to you, that you may know that I am alive & well. We arrived at the place where I now am[3] on the 8th inst, which is on the western side of the *rock mountains* on a branch of the north fork of Lewis' river. We are in a valley 6 or 8 miles wide with mountains covered with snow on both sides, still the weather very fine & good feed for our horses. Sometimes a frost at night. Here they come from the states to trade with the Indians & those that hunt beaver, no other fur is worth carrying so far, bring traps alms & ahminition, beads & other triinkets, and all sorts of groceries, flower rice &c. flower & rice $1.50 pr. pound, sugar, coffee ea. $2. all in proportion. A few yards of scarlet cloth, string of beads & paper of vermilion, awl, & fishook will buy a horse. The indians have many. It is known before hand where the traders are to come & the indians & hunters assemble, there are in this place within five miles Seven or 8 thousand horses & mules, & one or two thousand whites & indians. But in a few weeks they will scatter to the four winds of heaven, buffalow & other wild animals resume their pasture, for understand the whole country for a thousand miles is one pasture with only trees on the streams & a few pine & fir scattered on the mountains, grass of many kinds & good feed, but no

[3] Pierre's Hole, since known as Teton's Basin. It is a valley about thirty miles long and several miles in width in eastern Idaho.

herds grass or clover. all over the praires in bunches is a shrub from 1 to 4 feet high called *wild sage,* it tastes & resembles wormwood, it is some in the way in traveling, the grass is thin among it, but good on the flats a[nd] moist places. The indians that are here belong still lower to the west, they are a fine race of men, perfectly honest in all respects, they say, & we feel a[s] safe from injury or loss, as I should in my old native neighbourhood, they come up to trade & hunt buffalow which are plenty here but are not in their country 400 miles below, and they now supply the whole camp with dried buffalow, for they are drive[n] off some miles by the assembly here. the[y] dress in skins well dressed like deer skins you see, in different ways, generally a kind of trowsers & frock with well dressed buffalow robe such as you see to throw over their shoulders, side on &c. But many are in cloth for they will purchase any old clothing and a blanket instead of a robe. Our only food is the dried meat, eat it as it is, or boil it, fat & lean together into a kind of stew, very good food, as for their flower &c. I dispence with it, tho' some appear much to hanker for the leaks & onions, but till we got here had fresh buffalow in abundance, it is about the same as beef, becoming at this season very fat & good, there are also deer, elks, & antelope & here baar & a kind of wild sheap, also small game.

Well my dear parents, I know nothing how it is with you or any of those I have left behind. Heaven grant that it may be well with all. And when shall I hear from you? that I can not tell tho hope to before time has produced great changes. The only direction I can give about writing to me is to direct to (John Ball of the Pacific Trading Company, to the care of Messrs. Tucker & Williams Boston) please pay postage to Boston, they are to forward by shipping. And mother, if it would be any particular gratification to send a course pare of socks or two or course pair of pantaloons, they would forward them if put up in a box (mind put in tobaccow or something to preserve them against moths. But be sure understand I do not ask them for I am well provided for in the usual way, have now on buffalow mockesons instead of socks & shoes & find them good. We leave here in a few days for the ocean, have now accomplished about two thirds of our journey from the settlements, have passed all danger from the natives as is firmly believed; we are

with those now that I would trust any length & shall go thro' their country probably travel with them. Where buffalow grow scarce salmon become very plenty, so we fear not for want of good food. To be sure it is not fanny's table, but when it is all that can be had it is just as well. I assure you I care little about it, then there is so much that is new & interesting, what we shall go about I cannot say precisely, but we can trade, farm, hunt, fish &c., and I will of course let you hear from me as often as possible & may soon return. I send back by a trading company with whom we came out. These people call the distance we have come over from the settlements fifteen hundred miles, I can think it hardly so far, tho' it is a long journey, we were just eight weeks on the way, rode some, & walked some, each had the care of one or two pack horses packed with goods. At light was the cry of up up from the commander of the band, sometimes travel 8 or 10 miles before breakfast, but usually eat & harnaced at five, off stop at 10 or 11. fo[r] 1 or 2 hours then till towards night, let the horses have a small range but always stake them within our camp at night, the camp a square, with the tents around the sides, we had about 80 men & from 250 to 300 horses & mules & marched in two lines. We have a tent that we sometimes pitch, but oftener than otherwise my bed has been a buffalow skin on the ground & small pack under my head, my oald cloak with the cape thrown over my head around me & a blanket over my feet & the heavens above, & never have I slept better, no cold, nor that dul head ake of feather beds the traveling most of the way like going through an open field tho 3 or 4 the last days it was up & down mountains & places you would not think a horse with a pack could go, but I was often tired, but stood it as well as any of my companions. We saw no indians except some night [nigh] the settlements till we came here, but they were supposed to sometimes be about to steal, and one night they fired some guns & arrows on the camp, to friten the horses & stole eleven & were off, we supposed them the Black feet, friends neither to whites or blacks. I intend to write to some others but may not be able to as have much to do. give my love to all, how is W^{m} & his folks, Nath^{l} & his all our sisters & theirs, give my special love to all, I would like to be with you well a few days, tho' I do not realise the distance at which I am

from you, still I do not give up hopes of seeing you all again, but of course know the uncertainty. Do not dear parents feel uneasy about me, but happy while life lasts. I shall write to Lansingburgh hope they are doing well & are happy, I did all the good there I thought myself capable & know not how much harm I fear some, still all their matters will go on well enough. It seems odd thus [to] be be shut out from the rest of the world, but then I am rid of its broils, political & every other kind, so there is a gain. There will be new lords & new laws before I hear from the busy world again, may all go well. Now dear father & Mother as I lay on a buffalow in the bright sun & write to you at ten o'clock in the morning, it is nigh one with you so far I am to the west, but reccollect 'tis the same bright sun shines on you and on your unworthy son

John Ball

To Father & Mother Ball dated July 13 1832 Mail'd, 5 Oct.
Addressed: M^r^ Nathaniel Ball Hebron N. H.

Oh Dear Brother,

For an opportunity to converse with you instead of this substitute, still this is better than no way of communication. How is your health &c. I trust better, & how Sarah & the children give them my warmest love. I can not see you at present, but feel myself I shall notwithstanding all sad forbodings. I am provoked to think that I can [not] hear from you by letter sooner, But direct to me as one of the "Pacific Trading Co." To the care of Tucker & Williams, Boston, & they will probably before long have a chance to send by sea, & thro' them I will send home to you any thing interesting, they have now a trunk of mine to forward on. Do'nt work to hard at your haying or Sarah at her dary & wool, but be moderate in all things. To tell you something of the country I have passed thro' The State of Missouri is settled to its very border & a very fine country it is, there ends white population entirely, but the country continues good for 100 miles, except hardly a supply of timber. We went off from the Missouri river on the South & crossed the Kansas river at the indian village about a hundred miles from its mouth then across to the river Platte at the grand island. The soil grows poorer & poorer till here the grass does

not grow large enough to burn, nor did I see any prarie burnt west of this. It is all the way hilly or what is called rolling land, but little stony, that mostly lime stone. Here I first came to the trial (no trial at all) of eating beef & mutton witho[ut] any thing but salt no salt now and that is nothing. We found no game till we came to the fork of the Platte, then Buffalow in plenty, they are almost the sole food of this region, tho' we killed elk, deer & antelope. The Platte from 1 to 3 miles wide, shallow & rappid & muddy, the bottoms or entervails as wide on each side, & excelent pasture, but the sandy broken plane beyond is thinly covered with grass & weeds, no water except the showers of heaven. There are many plants usually seen in cultivated lands, hay weed nettles, Summer savery, pepper mint on the streams, Southern wood, and spread from this to the columbia is a shrub called wild sage from 1 to 4 ft high a[nd] resembles wormwood. It is very troublesome to the traveler, growing in bunches all over the ground. Traveled up the Platte to the forks crossed the South one & continued up the N. one to a great distance. You can judge little of any of this country by maps, & nothing of the mountains. Country very similar till we reach the Black Hills, which is barely [?] a rocky hilly country not remarkable. below them there is no wood even on the river, used buffalow dung instead does very well when dried, try your cow dung from the pasture a year old. The bottoms are strewed with their bones, & I saw one herd that extended along the river 15 miles, believe me, there were probably ten thousand of them, then perhaps we would hardly see one for a day or two they have one open pasture here of a thousand miles square Another singularity in this country, it seldom rains, 'twill thunder & blow neither dew, nor rain, the river does not apperantly increase in size, all to be accounted for I think from the dry gravelly soil for an immence extent. This N. branch comes from the S. West in the mountains, & when we got to the mountains we took a branch called the Sweetwater coming from the W.— (Oh we often meet with spots encrusted with salt along the N. branch of the Platt) Now we had come to the granite mountains, still they only rise occasionally out of the sandy plane, and the Rocky mountains themselves one of this discrip-

tion. But that plane is so high that the tops of the mountains are constantly covered with snow, tho' I have seen none so prominent as the White mountains. I think [some are] 15,000 feet above the ocean for by an experiment I find the place where I am 8500. The whole is a steep plane to the Mississippi for the water runs 5 miles an hour. The Sweetwater rises in the same cluster with the yellow stone & a hundred or two [miles] S. E. from the Sourses of the Missouri. And when we had gained its sourse what water do you think we came on to! The Colorado that falls into the gulph of California & traveled across the uper branches of that stream more than a hundred miles, then came to the waters of the Columbia about 5 days before we reached this place. These mountain regions have a climate of their own, this morning there was a frost, in the middle of the day by experiment Summer heat at the same time as I write out of doors, my head is Saluted by a slight hail shower. Flowers, herbs, & fruit grow & flourish amidst the snows. We stoped not till we reached this place, been here a week, feel much rested & never weller. The journey was rather hard. Mr Sublette the man who commanded the concern & who has spent 8 years in the business, dashes ahead through the icy streams to his shoulders nor minds any thing about it, of course all for love. What will be hereafter I do not know but we have refited purchased horses of the Indians till we have two each, & shall not have to pack half, shall go on & explore the country & see what business can be done. We are probably here not far from the bounds of Mexico, but the hunters and traders are the lords of the soil on these mountains from the center of Mexico to the pole, tho' many streams & valies even they do not yet know.

Please give my love to all. I have written to father & mother & would to others but I cannot. I think as often of my old home as tho' nigher, in fact it seems not far, nor is very far. Be happy my dear brother till I again see you & I will be more particular.

Your Brother

Nath[l] Ball John Ball

15. July 1832

No. 2 dated 15 July 1832. maild 1832

Addressed: M[r] Nath[l] Ball Junior Hebron Newhampshire

Fort VanCouver, Jan^{y} 1st 1833.

My Dear Brinsmade,

Would that this anniversary of our parting could bring meeting, that I might again press your hand and wish you happiness. Or could I know your present wellfare and that of your family and my other Lansingburgh acquaintances, and the transactions of the past year, it would be a *newyears* treat indeed. Has peace and good fortune attended you[r] path, or have the fates frowned on my friend? Have those about you been prosperous and happy, or has some dire catastrophy befallen your village? No. I will presume that you are all, at least as joyous as usual on this first day of the year. My first thought this morning was, that you had already exchanged your good wishes, for you must recollect that your longitude gives you more than three hours the start of us on the Columbia. When you receive this, please wish all a happy newyear and *years* for me. And since I can know nothing about you and yours, permit me on this day to say something about myself.

We stoped at the place where I last wrote you, in the mountains, till the 24th July, during which time a skirmish took place between the whites and friendly Indians and a party of the Black feet Indians. It lasted the most part of a day, the Black feet having fortified themselves in some timber nigh a creek. We were about a mile distant during the action, being prohibited by our immediate Captain from joining, so I took no other part, than to assist in taking care of the wounded and guarding our own camp. The result was that the whites & their friends retreated at approach of night with 7 killed or mortally wounded and as many Indians, the enemy, they supposed demolished, there probably not being more than fifty of them, tho' but ten scalps were taken and 32 horses killed. the whole appeared to me a needless and rash affray, for the Blackfeet wished to avoid the engagement.[4] Twelve of our party (the rest chusing to return or to trap in the mountains,) started on our journey in company with 40 trapers, first 40 or 50 miles S.

[4] A somewhat fuller account of this battle is given in John B. Wyeth, *Oregon; or, A short history of a long journey from the Atlantic ocean to the region of the Pacific, by land* (Cambridge, Mass., 1833).

across the Lewis river, then S. W. 300 miles along the head waters of creeks falling into that river from the S. then we came to streems runing in the opposite direction, and parted company with the trappers, and pursued for a general course N. W. say 400 miles, a part of the time on and a part off the Lewis river, we reached the Columbia at Fort Wallawala, nine miles south of its mouth. Here we left our horses and took a boat of the Hudson Bay Companys for this place, where we arrived the last of October, having been much delayed by living in company with trappers, and pursuing the same business ourselves. From here five of us took an Indian canoe and went down the river to Fort George (Astoria) and the Ocean. You may well suppose I felt some interest in reaching the end of my journey and seeing the immence *Pacific.*

Where we crossed Lewis river the first part of our journey, I first met with volcanic rock resting on coarse pudding stones. Soon after with hills & mountains of no great elevation of lime stone. But soon found that most of the rocks presented a burnt appearance, not unlike an oven burnt brickiln, the strata being displaced by being melted down. In one place saw marble & mica slate not burnt, in another a ruged track of burnt granite, the quartz particles being vitrified and transparent, also scattered extensively, volcanic glass. At one place on the Lewis river lower down the basalt of 30 feet thickness rests on sand, and towards the mouth of that river there are high ridges, called the blue mountains of the same rock In short within 300 miles of the ocean I saw no other kind of rock, except in a very few instances sand stone underlaying the same, it often presents a regularity of form equal to the Giants Casaway From 100 to 150 miles from the co[a]st is a range of high & regular peaks, so high as always to be clothed with snow, extending at entervals for a great distance N. & S. of which are mounts Hood St Hellens. Above the tide water of the Columbia & as you approach the co[a]st you find abrupt ragged volcanic mountains, not however of great elivation. One immence prarie, extends from the mountains, with the exception of scattering trees mostly of the pines gums on the mountains, to the falls of the Columbia Along the streams are willows & often rank grass, elsewhere a thin crop of grass or shrubery, the soil generally very barren.

At the falls commences a scattering groth of oak, & at tide water a thick growth of lofty trees of different kinds, still there are many praries till you get nigh the coast, where the growth of vegitables of all kinds is enormous.

We passed a great distance through what is called the Snake Country, the inhabitants of which do not appear as well as those we saw in the mountains, hunt the buffalo some (tho that animal does not range below the American falls) [live] on Salmon, which they dry, & much on roots of different kinds. In this quarter & on the Columbia below they live on fish principally, on the Wallamette (Multnomah) on camas & wappatoo. Divided into many small tribes and are not given to warfare.

This is the general dapot of the Hudson Bay Company, this side of the mountains, here arrives & departs an express *once* a year for Hudson's Bay & Montreal, and a ship annually arrives from England, they have also 3 smaller vessels trading on the co[a]st & supplying 2 or 3 posts they have on the co[a]st to the N. they have also a number of posts above and far to the N, inland, in short have extended their business (traping & trading for furs) from California to the pole. You are aware of the long standing of that company & its great wealth, their opperations corrspond to their ability. It is 7 years since they commenced here on a plane, and having found it very expensive supplying the great number they employ from England or else where, they have gone quite extensively into agricultural pursuits, have raised the past year many hundred bushels of wheat barley peas, Indian corn, potatoes & garden vegitables, have planted fruit trees among the rest the vine & peach, have 300 or 400 head of cattle sheap & hogs, & horses, which they get from the Indians. This pursuit appears to prosper well in their hands, tho' commenced by them with difficulty.

Fort Vancouver February 23[d] 1833

Dear Father & Mother,

Every thing else gave me not so many unpleasant feelings on resolving on coming to this country as the distance it would place me from you. And now I often sigh to see you, and to breathe again the pure air, and look out on the rugged mountains, where I was born and nurtered by your kind hands. And I still trust that I shall again see you my parents, and my native

land. It is a new situation, for now I cannot even hear from you to know if you are well and happy.

Believing that you still feel that interest in me that is usual to parents, and that you have always manifested towards me, I will now inform me [you] of my welfare. My health has been uniformly good ever since I saw you 15 months ago, and never better than now. I wrote from the mountains, & hope my letters were received, and that this will be also. I continued my journey across the country, leaving the place where I wrote the last of July & arrived at this place the last of October. Afterwards went to the ocean, 100 miles below this place, then returned here, where, I have remained since in comfortable quarters, teaching a few boys, enjoying all the usual accomidations of house and good living. This is a post of the Hudson Bay Company, a company which extends its trade for furrs from Canada to this place, and they have here extensive farming opperations, raise wheat, corn, peas, potatos, and most vegetables usually cultivated in gardens, have a number of head of cattle, and dairy of course, hogs & sheap. I have been very civilly treated by them, tho' possessed of no introductory letters, or any thing to recommend me, but the most shabby appearance, destitute of every thing, for little can be brought under any usual circumstances across such an extent of wilderness country. And now, *father*, I am going at the trade you taught me, but as I think in a country better than you selected, that is more comforts can be obtained with less labor, more healthy it cannot be, but perhaps I am too fast, you know your changable weather brings on colds & those colds consumptions. Here for three years past some have had the fever & ague, tho never known, even within the recollection of the natives before, it is otherwise thought one of the healthiest regions in the world. I shall have to begin farming with few tools and accomodations. But mind you my farm is cleared and I have the choice out of a tract as large as the state of Newhampshire except what is occupied by seven farmers who commenced last year. I am going onto the Multnomah nigh the mouth of which is this post. Shall settle in the neighbourhood of those already there. I have this week returned from looking out a place, find the soil good and most of it prarie, still timber in abundance for fencing building

fires &c & well dispersed over the country, white oaks often grow on the planes like an orchard, and groves of firs & other timber the same kind of fir that you have groes here to a great hight & three or four feet thro' answering for all the uses to which you put the white pine, there is another tree called the red fir, the timber of which is like the yellow pine, immencely large. The grand advantage here is the climate, for there is so little winter that I found the cattle horses & hogs on the Multnomah fat, tho none of them had been fed a straw this winter. In fact I have not seen a flake of snow to lay on the ground a moment, & hail but in one instance which lay one or 2 inches deep for one day. Much rain in December, & in January so cold that the Columbia froze over, but the Multnomah did not. some trees are now in bloom and in favourable spots the fresh grass has grown six inches. The Indians have horses which they sell at 8 dollars but cattle are still scarce, there being none this side of California except what have sprung from a bull & seven cows brought there seven years ago if I am rightly informed. Any thing can be raised here that can with you, and many that cannot. Many kinds of fruit trees have been introduced which succeed well. But recollect that I am not in possession of these things myself, but have hopes to be after a while from the generous conduct of those who are their owners.

I have seen the Country, the discription of which from John Ordway so much interested you, when he returned from his tour with Lewis & Clark. The natives with their flattened heads are nearly the same, tho' a residence of some white people in their neighbourhood for more than 20 years has doubtless had its effect, they have exchanged their skin dresses, to considerable extent for cloth. They wear nothing on their feet, but wear a kind of apron & blanket or skin, some however have adopted the dress of the whites. They are not warlike people in this quarter, tho' sometimes individuals are killed, but payment of some valuable articles are said to satisfy his friends. The practice of the whites is to chastise any aggression severely, thinking for mutual benefit. They live on whatever is nighest at hand & easiest obtained, nor do they lay up full stores for the future, still they do not wholly neglect it, drying salmon & roots. On the Multnomah they live almost entirely on roots principally

Camas & Wappatoo, but they prefer the potato or any of the food of the whites when they can get it, so they may eventually turn to cultivation. Be under no apprehensions on account of them for with common prudence no difficulty is to be feared [&] besides [the]y are fond of having the whites come a[mong] them. I hope hereafter to let you know more about them & other things in this country

In the first place receive for yourselves my warmest love & gratitude, hoping that when you receive this you will be well & happy & also that I shall again thus *see* you. Give my love to those first of your household, to Nath[l] & folks, to Sister Colby, and how does she get along in her state of widowhood is her son Calvin with her on her farm? I hope before this she has given to him much of her care, love to, Brother Ladd & children, Sister Brooks & husband & children, how are they all in health &c. to Sister Ferrin & folks also, how much I wish to see them all, or at least to know their condition. Tell them I could not write to all, but all may to me, and you may consider the information in this as for all. My love also to the aged in particular, are they still all alive? And in short to all whom I knew in my native place. Those mountains & vallies are beautiful, but not less so are those, where now dwells your

Grateful Son

John Ball

From J. Ball, to his Father Fort Vancouver Feb. 23. 1833.
Addressed: M[r] Nathaniel Ball Hebron, Newhampshire

European treaties bearing on the history of the United States and its dependencies to 1648. Edited by Frances G. Davenport. [Carnegie institution of Washington, Publication No. 254. Papers of the department of historical research, J. Franklin Jameson, editor] (Washington, D. C.: Carnegie institution of Washington, 1917. 387 p.)

To most students Miss Davenport's volume will be a revelation. Even those who have specialized in American diplomacy generally skip the period between the papal bulls and the treaty of Utrecht, or at best bestow merely a hasty glance upon its problems, arising chiefly from the proximity of the expanding English colonies to their Dutch, French, and Spanish neighbors. Such students have recognized that affairs in America up to 1763 were almost wholly determined in European capitals, but they needed some such demonstration as the present volume, with scarcely a gap of twenty years between documents, to show them that this determination was of great moment and of varied documentary bulk.

Miss Davenport presents forty documents in the present volume, which ends in 1648, and promises another covering the period to 1713, where most students begin their serious work. Nine papal bulls appear in the list. Comparatively few of the state papers are concerned with lines of demarcation. Trading privileges and allied topics, the activities of corsairs and their mercantile abettors, and the growing jealous rivalry in colonial exploitation account for most of the material herein given. No one will quarrel with this procedure, which rightly emphasizes the economic side of colonization even if it increases so greatly the mass of our available diplomatic material.

Four documents, three of them emanating from the pope, precede the explorations of Columbus. A like number of bulls, in May and September, 1493, attempt to regulate the conflicting claims that arise from the fortunate landfall of the Genoese mariner. The first sixteen documents, up to April, 1529, and a later one, dated 1552, are wholly taken up with the affairs of Spain and Portugal, primarily in the far east; but the territorial and trading questions between the two countries are left unsettled at the latter date. Still the volume will permit a more thorough study of these questions in English than has hitherto

been possible. A treaty between Portugal and France in 1536 marks the first appearance of the latter country and also the beginning of the policy of combination among the enemies of Spain which broke the attempted colonial monopoly of that power. From this date on, France, England, the Netherlands, and even Denmark, and the colonies of Massachusetts Bay and Arcadia, are represented in the negotiations that aim to secure the results of more lawless exploits elsewhere. Of the colonizing powers that were active during the first half of the seventeenth century, Sweden alone is not represented. Its name does not even appear in the index. The series fittingly closes with extracts from the treaty of Muenster, which definitely recognized the colonial rights of the Dutch and marked the formal renunciation by Spain of her assumed commercial supremacy in the new world.

The text of the documents is given in Latin, Spanish, Portugese, Dutch, and French, with an English translation in each case for all except the last named. The editor furnishes a general introduction that develops the historical setting for each document and in addition precedes each with a more detailed account of the events leading up to the negotiation that produced it. With some adaptation these introductions might be woven into a brief but valuable diplomatic history of early American colonization, and it is to be hoped that Miss Davenport will be able to supply this needed volume. Her bibliographic notes show what her friends already knew, that she has visited nearly all the important archives of western Europe in searching for original manuscripts. In a few cases only has she been unable to find these originals; in more cases she offers originals for the first time. When documents have already been printed, she refers definitely to the best available texts and translations, and her work shows most careful collation both with original manuscripts and with printed texts. Her references to contemporary and early writings and to later accounts are exceedingly complete and make the volume serviceable in advanced college classes. These and the wealth of annotation fill one with a respectful admiration for her patience and accurate scholarship, of which the general editor in his preface modestly hints. Such work as Miss Davenport has done speaks for itself with the discerning reader, to whom, alas! the audience is restricted. The index, by David M. Matteson, adds to the usefulness of the book. Students will await with confident interest Miss Davenport's second volume, carrying the story down to 1713, and commend the Carnegie institution as well as the editors for this substantial contribution to colonial diplomacy.

I. J. C.

Las Casas. "The apostle of the Indies." By Alice J. Knight. (New York: Neale publishing company, 1917. 100 p. $1.25 net).

This little book should prove useful. The name of the great "apostle of the Indies" ought to become as familiar to English readers as that of Cortez and of Pizarro, if not of Columbus, and a book for children, obviously written to make it so, will be welcome. The author has profited from the work of Helps and Fiske, but she does not mention the former. Her narrative, creditable but not striking, embraces the more common facts known about Las Casas, and she fills in *lacunae* with a few general descriptions culled from obvious sources. It would have been well to describe more fully a few institutions like *encomienda* and *audiencia,* if she hoped to make the Spanish colonial background more real. Consistency requires that *clerico* as well as *padre* should be italicized, but there is no reason for discarding "cleric." The frontispiece is the traditional picture of Las Casas.

Dramatic moments in American diplomacy. By Ralph W. Page. (New York: Doubleday and Page company, 1918. 284 p. $1.25).

One result of the late war has been to arouse the American people to the need of "diplomatic sense." The present volume represents an attempt to answer this need, as supposedly voiced by the "man on the street." Possibly the specialist in history is unable to give a fair judgment of the effort, but his natural query after a hasty perusal will inevitably be, "What's the use?" He is unconscious of any reaction that will lead him to change or adapt materially his own point of view and he knows the narrative will only fill the more uninformed reader with misconceptions. Popularization of history, taking that subject in any sense, is an unattainable dream. The specialist cannot do it, for his theme obsesses him; the hack writer fails still more miserably for he lacks the background of knowledge and fears too strongly the supposedly hungry-eyed reader. There is still room for a brief, scholarly but creditable book on American diplomacy.

Development of Japan. By Kenneth Scott Latourette, professor of history, Denison university. [Published under the auspices of the Japan society] (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 237 p. $1.50 net)

Whatever the new developments in the teaching of history, one result is certain — more attention will be paid to the past of nations hitherto ignored. Because of their physical relation to America, China and Japan will largely profit by this change of emphasis. In anticipation of the new interest, Mr. Latourette has followed his excellent *Development of China* with a similar volume on Japan. Together, they

furnish the textbooks needed for a semester course on the far east; they furnish equally good reading for the private student.

The chapter on the geographic setting of Japan makes one wish for more, so well is the relation of land and folk brought out. Most interesting is the proof that, in spite of the various strata in the population, preserved to the present in the differences between nobility and aristocracy, the environment welded all the elements into a single homogeneous people of a highly distinctive type. Equally well are brought out the causes which have made the Japanese warriors from the beginning.

Sufficient attention has been given to the earlier and more or less mythical history. Its annals are indeed not particularly interesting in detail, but the general picture presented is of the utmost value. The introduction of foreign customs from China anticipated the similar movement in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Particularly satisfactory is the parallel with the earlier adjustment to an entirely alien industrial system, in each case not sufficiently marked to overcome entirely the militaristic basis. At this time was likewise developed that theory of the monarchy which preserved the line of rulers at the expense of their power, and which has again been utilized in giving the modern state a worship of the monarch. Students of our own middle ages have already devoted some little attention to the parallel feudalism and manorialism in Japan; to the less sophisticated reader this part will have its own fascination. Throughout the whole of this section, there are excellent studies of the culture, the more valuable as they are brought into close touch with the political movements.

The story of the last half century is more familiar, but none the less interesting. Latourette has been unusually successful in omitting useless details, whether of war or of the rapidly shifting political groupings, and has thus made more clear movements on a large scale. He has brought out the undemocratic nature of the constitution and the fact that it was modeled on that of Germany. His account of the last few years is fair to Japan but by no means entirely laudatory. He has attempted to view the movements from their point of approach, but he has likewise indicated the defects of Japan from the foreign. As we should expect, relations with China are stressed and Chinese thought indicated. American participation in the affairs of the far east is chronicled without bias. It speaks well for the author's objectivity that the Japan society has brought out the book under its auspices. The most interesting appendix is still to be written, the story of Japan at the peace conference!

A. T. Olmstead

Processes of history. By Frederick J. Teggart, associate professor of history, University of California. (New Haven: Yale university press, London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford university press, 1918. 162 p. $1.25 net)

The author has attempted in a tentative way to develop a philosophy of history under the guise of suggesting how it should be studied and written. In the brief resumé of various interpretations of history he has made some excellent suggestions to the writers as well as to the readers of history. He differentiates the problem of the biologist in his scientific researches from that of the historian but indicates how far the Darwinian concept of evolution is serviceable in the processes of history. The author attempts with a fair degree of success to harmonize the conflicting claims of those who have sought to explain history as the effect of environment and those who hold to the "humanistic" theory. While avoiding the dogmatic, he has made a clear and forceful presentation of some of the difficulties in the path of the honest historian and he must be commended, above all, for keeping his discussion free from the learned rubbish with which this subject has usually been encumbered in the past. This brief and lucid statement of his position gives reasonable grounds for the hope that the author will elaborate in a more complete form the thesis he has so clearly set forth in the present work.

History of the American people. By Charles A. Beard and William C. Bagley. (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 678 p. $1.20)

The demand for revision of our grammar and secondary school programs in the field of American history in recent years has proceeded along several lines. There was first the demand that western history be given due recognition. Later, the change of emphasis from political and military to industrial and social topics won favor. Now we are asking for the expansion and reorganization of our history since the civil war. The text under review represents a response to these demands. The topic western migration and life is given chapters, instead of paragraphs. A chapter dealing with the settlement and progress of the Rocky mountain and Pacific states since the civil war is unique.

The most pronounced feature of the book, however, is found in the chapters dealing with industrial and social events and changes. The industrial revolution of a century ago thus assumes its proper place in American history. In the period since the civil war the topics industrial development, immigration, and combinations of labor and capital have distinct chapters. In each period, too, there are chapters upon the development of our educational systems and upon the advance of democratic ideas and practices. Thus the boys and girls are given opportunity to learn more about the origin and growth of those commonplace

features of our life in all its phases than is offered by any other text of this grade.

The principal fault of the book is found in the fact that this fresh material is sometimes presented in language too difficult for the grammar school student. Too often the style smacks of the college lecture room. Doubtless the children of college professors will manage it readily, but the great majority are of another type. The authors' style, however, possesses an originality and virility that makes it particularly attractive.

The pedagogical helps consist of questions and exercises found at the ends of chapters. These are sometimes intended merely to recall the facts of the text; again, they are excellent examples of thought questions. There are also topics and references for collateral reading.

The authors have made decided progress in the direction of topical rather than chronological grouping in the arrangement of subject matter. This is marked in the period since the civil war and is most commendable. The book closes with a good chapter upon the great war and our entrance into it.

In respect to both historical accuracy and physical make-up, the text is on a plane with the best of its rivals.

A. H. Sanford

American spirit. A basis for world democracy. Edited by Paul Monroe, Ph.D., LL.D., Director school of education, Columbia university, and Irving E. Miller, Ph.D., department of education, Washington state normal school (Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World book company, 1918. 336 p.)

Under the thesis that there is "one American Spirit" and that not "loose amalgamation ready to fall apart under special stress and tension," the authors have selected the loftier phases of American history with a trend toward effervescent idealism. The revolutionary fathers now come into their own in well-chosen quotation, but the framers of that "sacred" document the American constitution have been overlooked, perhaps outlawed because of their distrust of democracy; is this not a conspiracy of silence such as the all too flexible espionage act warns against? Later the ante bellum renegade, William Lloyd Garrison, is allowed to herald "liberty for all" as part of "the faith of the fathers," while President William McKinley proclaims "American ideals not imperialistic" in "The fight for a cause." In general the attempt is made to take the emphasis from the things that have divided us by "exalting the things that unite us in 1918." In the introduction the blame for the American revolution is laid at the feet of the "German king, George III." Yet Lord Charnwood lecturing on this subject found the causes mainly in the corruption and factionalism of parliamentary govern-

ment; when asked privately whether George III could be blamed as "a German king," he replied, "Any offenses of George III grew out of his attempt to become a good old-fashioned English king."

In the hands of a teacher who appreciated, rather better than the editors do at times, his duty to the science of history, this little textbook in democracy would be found most useful. The section on "Patriotism" is rich in glowing idealism and calls Kipling, Sir Walter Scott, and Cardinal Mercier to reinforce the American spokesmen; fortunately the editors are no party to a campaign of hate against Germany such as might come to embarrass the nation as much as they admit is the case of the traditional "twisting of the lion's tail."

Thirty-first annual report of the bureau of American ethnology (Washington: government printing office, 1916. 1037 p.)

This ponderous volume is devoted to "Tsimshian mythology." It has nothing to do with the United States. If you wish to know who the Tsimshians are, any encyclopedia will tell you that they are a tribe or family of something less than five thousand souls, living on the coast of British Columbia, just below Alaska. The apparent reason for this attention to foreign tribes, when so many people want information about the Indians of the United States, is that Dr. Franz Boas, the ruling power of the bureau of ethnology, is interested in Tsimshians, and is the author of the "Mythology."

Most of the learned volume is composed of ordinary Indian folk tales, many of them concerning "Txä'msem." Do not be alarmed. This is one of the simple names of this erudite work, not to be compared with "Hats !eks-n !e°x," or "Xbi-ye'lk," or "Pdâ'lem haha'yêtsk," or "Ndzē°dz-yu-wa-xsā'ntk," or others that make it interesting and readable. These are not efforts of a beginner on the typewriter, nor a list of Bolsheviki. They are triumphs of cubist phonetic art — verbal presentations of "The nude descending a staircase," as it were.

They are printed in this way in order that you may know exactly how to pronounce them, and, in order to forestall mistake, the book furnishes an "alphabet." As applied to "Txä'msem," for example, the directions are as follows:

"t, surd and fortis of d."
"x velar spirant, like ch in German Bach."
(ä no direction given).
"m as in English."
"s the tip of the tongue is turned up and touches the palate just behind the alveoli. The teeth are closed, and the air escapes laterally. The acoustic effect is intermediate between s and sh."
"e obscure, weak e, as in flower."

Now that you are fully advised — all together — pronounce!

It is to be regretted that the work of preserving the Indian languages of the United States, which Major Powell supposed he had inaugurated more than forty years ago, has reached this pass. That it has, is plainly due to the prevalence of German kultur in the work, with its devotion to phonetics and its neglect of really important features.

No sane man will ever read this report in full. Possibly a sane man might start to read it, but if he persisted he would not be sane when he finished. Its only use will be to "fill a set." It is almost pathetic that funds intended for some practical benefit to the American people should be expended on such publications.

J. P. Dunn

State constitutions and the federal constitution and organic laws of the territories and other colonial dependencies of the United States of America. Compiled by Charles Kettleborough, Ph.D., director Indiana legislative and statistical bureau. (Indianapolis: B. F. Bowen and company, 1918. 1644 p.)

As indicated by the title, this compilation contains the texts of the federal and state constitutions and also the organic acts relating to Alaska, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Philippines, the Panama Canal zone, the Virgin islands, and the minor insular dependencies. The constitutions are given in the form in which they stand amended at the date of publication of this compilation. Where sections or articles have been added to the constitution since its original adoption, this fact is indicated. Also, where an article or section of the original constitution has been amended, pains have been taken to indicate the language of the original text as well as that of the amendment and also the date of the amendment.

This compilation is a welcome addition to our apparatus for studying the constitutions in spite of the fact that we have Thorpe's elaborate edition of constitutions and organic laws issued in 1909 in seven volumes. This arises not only from the fact that much constitutional development has taken place in the last decade but also because the present work corrects many of the deficiencies in the earlier compilation. Those who are interested in the historical development of constitutions must use Thorpe with great caution in order to avoid being misled. Thus it is impossible to find in Thorpe the full text of the important original provision of the Ohio constitution of 1851 which introduced the general property tax into the constitution of that state for the first time. This provision, however, is correctly printed by Kettleborough in a footnote on page 1080 of his collection. By relying on Thorpe, Holcombe, in his *State*

government in the United States, was misled into stating (p. 112) that the governor's item veto originated in the New Jersey constitution of 1844, whereas this device was first adopted in that state by an amendment of 1875, as indicated by Kettleborough on page 930 of his compilation. The important amendment to the Colorado constitution providing for the advisory judicial opinion, adopted in 1886, which is carelessly omitted by Thorpe, is printed by Kettleborough on page 204.

It is hardly to be expected that a work of such magnitude as this publication involves could be entirely free from errors. The text of the fifteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States, which is apparently so elusive in character that it is omitted entirely by Thorpe, is printed by Kettleborough on page 10, but with two errors. As printed by the latter, the first few words of the amendment read: "The rights of the citizens," whereas the correct version is: "The right of citizens." In his list of authorities, Kettleborough cites as the authority for his text of the constitution of Illinois the edition issued in 1914 by Secretary of State Woods, with annotations by C. W. Tooke. This edition, however, as well as that printed in the *Illinois blue book* for 1915-1916, contains certain errors, some of which Kettleborough has corrected, while others he has incorporated in his compilation. Thus, he has corrected the obviously erroneous use of the word "effect" instead of "affect" in article VI, section 13, line 13 of Woods' edition; but the omission of the word "the" before the word "laws" in article V, section 14, line 3 and the word "of" before the word "all" in article V, section 21, line 1 in the Woods' edition are errors which Kettleborough incorporates in his compilation. In such a work as this, however, it is hardly to be expected that errors which are not obvious and which are contained in editions issued under official sanction should be corrected. On the whole, Kettleborough's collection of constitutions will be of great usefulness to all students of those documents.

J. M. MATHEWS

History of labour in the United States. By John R. Commons and associates. In two volumes. (New York: Macmillan company, 1918. 623; 620 p. $6.50 per set)

The *History of labour* — the English spelling being followed throughout the book in spite of its American subject and authorship — is the fourth in the series of *Contributions to American economic history*, the earlier volumes of which dealt respectively with commerce, manufactures, and transportation. In these volumes emphasis was laid upon physical environment as a determining factor in development, but the present study, as Mr. Farnam points out, is concerned more with

the power of ideas. Probably no more fertile field of study for this subject could be found than the United States, for here ideas have found free expression. Experiments have been tried in social and industrial organization, and legislation has attempted to cure many economic evils. It is the history of these broader movements that is told in these two volumes rather than the history of labor organizations or of labor processes in the work of production. The work is therefore of great value and interest to the historian as well as to the economist.

In a truer sense than any of the preceding volumes the *History of labour* is a coöperative undertaking. It is based upon an unusually large number of preliminary studies by various writers many of which have been published. In addition to this a large mass of original material was collected. How extensive this was may be judged from the fact that part of it has been published in the eleven volumes of the *Documentary history of American industrial society*. The seven authors named divided the field, each being responsible for a definite period. The results are throughout those of Mr. Commons, although on the surface he contributed only the preface and the introduction. Hardly a page in the book but bears the impress of his thought and often of his language, for his collaborators attended his lectures and seminars where the materials were assembled and interpreted. In spite of the monographic method, therefore, the work has been given a unity which is unusual in a detailed and encyclopedic work of this character.

Mr. Saposs has described colonial and federal beginnings to 1827, covering such topics as the origin of trade unions, the development of bargaining classes, the evolution of the merchant-capitalist, and the conspiracy cases. To Miss Sumner was assigned a shorter period, from 1827 to 1833, but one full of movement, for it covers the rise and growth of workingmen's parties in Philadelphia, New York, and other cities; their final failure, with an appraisement of the net results achieved. The turn to trade unions and their activities and disintegration from 1833 to 1839 is described by Mr. Mittelman. Under the head of "Humanitarianism" Mr. Hoagland carries forward the narrative from 1840 to 1860. This is perhaps the most interesting period in the history of labor, for it is filled with experiments in association and coöperation, in agrarianism, and numerous other "isms." Trade unionism was swamped in an ambitious attempt to reform industrial society completely.

The second volume begins with 1860. Under the heading "Nationalization" Mr. Andrews describes the leading movements in the period 1860-1877, especially the rise of national trade unions in the abortive effort at a national labor union. Mr. Perlman concludes the volume

with an account of upheaval and reorganization since 1876, this portion covering over one-quarter of the total. He traces the revolutionary beginnings of the International and similar organizations and their evolution from socialism to anarchism and syndicalism; political experiments with greenbackism and labor parties; the Knights of labor and the American federation of labor; the economic and political upheavals between 1884 and 1887 with the resulting reorganization both of political parties and of labor groups. The volume concludes with a useful critical bibliography.

This brief summary, inadequate as it is, will serve to convey some idea of the scope and content of the valuable study for which Mr. Commons is to be thanked. It is fairly encyclopedic in scope and will serve as a book of reference; but its literary excellence and the interest of the subject matter will prevent it from being merely a book of reference. It is conceived on broad lines and has been written without bias or prejudice, in a thoroughly scientific spirit. The highest praise must be accorded it.

E. L. Bogart

Workmen's compensation and insurance. By Durand Halsey Van Doren, LL.D. [Williams college, David A. Wells prize essays, number 5] (New York: Moffat Yard and company, 1918. 332 p. $2.00 net)

This is a "brief critical presentation of the subject, as distinguished from an exhaustive and non committal treatise," and is a valuable book for the general reader and the college or university student. It summarizes the historical development of workmen's compensation legislation, both in foreign countries and in the United States, makes critical comparisons between the different types of laws in vogue in this country, and then presents the author's idea of the requisites of an ideal compensation law.

The chapter on constitutionality is particularly good, but the data in the chapter on "The attitude of labor" is too fragmentary strongly to impress the reader. It is likewise unfortunate that the author gave detailed discussion to only the New Jersey law. The reasons which caused him to select one of the weakest of the American laws for analysis rather than to present also the essential features of some of the better laws are hardly satisfactory to the reader. The state insurance type of laws which are in such strong favor with the laboring classes and which the author himself advocates, deserve as detailed treatment as the private insurance type found in New Jersey. This would have given opportunity for a more adequate analysis of the commission plan of administration as contrasted with the court system.

D. D. Lescohier

American negro slavery. A survey of the supply, employment, and control of negro labor as determined by the plantation régime. By Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, Ph.D., professor of American history, University of Michigan. (New York: D. Appleton and company, 1918. 529 p. $3.00 net)

This book far transcends the limits of most histories dealing with slavery and at the same time falls short of illuminating certain aspects necessary to a complete portraiture of the institution. It is primarily an economic treatise presenting slavery as a commercial enterprise rather than as an evil which so deeply implanted itself in our life that much difficulty was experienced in eradicating it. Several important phases of this history are therefore neglected seemingly with a view to making a successful compilation or digest of numerous facts which have not hitherto been published.

As a history of slavery the book has adequate background in the treatment of the slave trade, the exploitation of Guinea, and the maritime traffic. The work increases in interest in that portion treating of slavery as a factor in the sugar industry of the West Indies and in the tobacco and rice culture of the plantations along the Atlantic. Some attention is given to the influence of the struggle of the rights of man on the betterment of the condition of the blacks, the subsequent change of attitude, and the difficulties involved in the prohibition of the slave trade. In the chapters bearing on the development of the cotton industry and the extension of the domestic slave trade the author has not given much more than has appeared in the works of several other investigators in this field.

He is at best in his treatment of the plantations. No one has hitherto given the public so much information about the management, labor, social aspects, and tendencies of the plantation. Much more, however, could have been said about the contrast between town and country slaves, about free negroes and the relation of those two classes to the poor whites of the south. More space should have been given also to the southern antislavery leaders who opposed slavery because it was an economic evil. While the book therefore is informing, it is for several reasons far from being the last word on its subject.

Among the author's shortcomings are his inability to fathom the negro mind, his failure to bring out the cycles of the history of slavery, and a tendency to argue to the contrary when facts seem to be unfavorable to the slaveholders. The facts of this book, moreover, are so arrayed as to indicate that the institution was in some respects defensible and that the negroes were satisfied with it. How can it be true that the blacks were contented when they from time to time resorted to servile insurrections

until the institution become so well established that resistance was suicidal? The author should not have neglected the uprisings which were common around Norfolk, Richmond, Petersburg, Charleston, and New Orleans during the days when slavery was reaching its most cruel form. Furthermore, although the slaves are mentioned as representing both persons and property the treatment lacks proportion in that it deals primarily with slaves as goods and chattels in the cold-blooded fashion that their masters bartered them away. In just the same way as a writer of the history of New England in describing the fisheries of that section would have little to say about the species figuring conspicuously in that industry, so has the author treated the negro in his work.

The book does not clearly show that slavery in America was first of a patriarchal order which later developed into an economic system. It does not bring out in bold relief that during the eighteenth century when the milder form of slavery obtained the condition of the negroes in this country was decidedly better than it was in the nineteenth century. The author has too little to say about the transition period when the industrial revolution resulting from the multiplication of mechanical appliances like the steam engine, power loom, spinning jenny, and cotton gin gave rise to such a demand for cotton and accordingly for an increase in the slave labor supply as to make slavery throughout the south a system of exploiting one man for the benefit of another. Because of this defect of the book the valuable facts contained therein may establish either the exception or the rule. For example, the statement that the slaves were content may be either true or untrue. It was true to some extent in the eighteenth century when they were well treated, was certainly untrue when slavery was changing from a patriarchal to an economic system, and was apparently true in the nineteenth century,—though in fact it was resignation to fate rather than contentment.

The same may be said about the author's treatment of the plantations. The life portrayed therein was characteristic of one period but not of all, in certain parts but not everywhere. It seems, too, that Mr. Phillips has not exhausted the study of the plantations, for many of the records cited are those of the most enlightened and benevolent slaveholders of the old south such as were never known to be the cruel and inhuman sort of masters who doomed the negroes to torture in the lower south. George Washington, George Mason, Z. Kingsley, Wade Hampton, and Jefferson Davis were certainly not of that class of slaveholders most numerous in the south. Z. Kingsley, for example, was of an unusually benevolent type. In contradistinction to many white men who sold their own flesh and blood in disposing of their offspring by black women, this master recognized his mulatto son, purchased an estate for him in Haiti, and

made it the nucleus of a colony to which he sent other emancipated negroes.

The author, moreover, makes certain statements which cannot be easily proved. Referring to the maritime slave trade, he says that "the food if coarse was plenteous and wholesome and the sanitation was fairly adequate." The best authorities do not support this contention. On page 306 he contends that in the actual régime severity was clearly the exception and kindness the rule on the plantation but supports his contention largely with the observations of two travelers, one of whom spoke of what he observed in all the slave states and the other who gave his observation of the situation in Virginia, where slavery was always of a mild form. The author tries also to minimize the prevalence of cases of slave women purchased by white men for purposes of concubinage and supports his contention with the assertion that in scanning thousands of bills of sale they exhibit little or no evidence to this effect (p. 194). An historian should not expect records of this sort to exhibit such evidence. While there were many white men who did not live above this reproach, the standard of morals among the majority was such that no purchaser would make a record of his desire to indulge in such a vice and the auctioneer would not always embarrass him by declaration to this effect. The reviewer has interviewed numbers of women of color, who assert that they were purchased and used for this base purpose.

While this book then is valuable because of the facts it contains, we must expect some other writer interested in this field to use these and other facts to set forth exactly what the institution was in its development from stage to stage and in its final form when it was exterminated by the civil war.

C. G. Woodson

Lincoln, the politician. By T. Aaron Levy. (Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1918. 236 p. $1.50)

Why is it that everyone who essays a contribution to Lincoln literature must needs make an addition to the vast bulk of worse than mediocre Lincoln biography? For such is this volume covering Lincoln's career through the election of 1856. Here in the same old eulogistic strain is a sixteen-chapter portrayal of the development of "the wisest politician in American history"; no wonder the reviewer of Lincolniana becomes more inclined to move the abolition of the superlative degree! Perhaps, however, one should display the same patience that the author applied to the task of culling his materials from the ever-expanding storehouse. Not that he has always chosen well and not that he has succeeded in presenting a well-knit synthesis. At times he would have profited from a more thorough study of the political background; of course "the Whig

and Democratic parties were little recognized in Indiana'' (p. 22) in 1824, but other regions had as little acquaintance. Throughout the book the author fails to recognize the social and economic implications of the whig and democratic parties and what Lincoln's affiliation with the whigs meant. We are told that he ''belonged to the Federal party by instinct'' (p. 17). But how explain political connections that made him subject to the charge, as Lincoln himself said in 1843, that ''I (a stranger, friendless, uneducated, penniless boy, working on a flatboat at ten dollars per month) have been set down as the candidate of pride, wealth, and aristocratic family traditions.'' (See *Writings of Lincoln*, federal edition, 1:317). When will an inspired interpreter illuminate Lincoln's early political affiliations by the light of whig origins in the west?

A. C. Cole

The voice of Lincoln. By R. M. Wanamaker. (New York: Charles Scribner's sons, 1918. 363 p. $2.50 net)

The author of this latest Lincoln book, Judge Wanamaker of the supreme court of Ohio, has long been an advocate of the idea that our schools should make more of the study of some of our great men, especially Lincoln. This book seems to have been written to show how such a study might be made profitable. The book, therefore, is not a biography nor can it be termed a character study; rather the author tries to let Lincoln reveal himself. At least this is the intention and purpose of the book. The author's thesis is to find out how Lincoln thought, what his mental methods were, how he developed his great efficiency in law, logic, language, and leadership. Lincoln himself, as far as possible, is permitted to answer the questions of the thesis.

The author first shows that Lincoln had two fundamental passions, the passion for knowledge and the passion for justice, both of which manifested themselves in his childhood and continued to be the underlying basis of his life and work. The companions of Lincoln's young manhood thought him lazy because he had a marked dislike for manual labor, but we are told by those who knew him that from a mental standpoint he was one of the most energetic young men of his day. Lincoln taught himself to write by writing compositions on various subjects and by learning every fine passage which he came across in his reading.

No passion of Lincoln's life was stronger than his passion for knowledge, save his passion for justice. Judge Wanamaker in his discussion of this passion of Lincoln's states that all the attributes associated with the attribute of justice were a part of Lincoln's nature, such as gentleness, helpfulness, gratitude, truthfulness, and honesty. The books he first studied all taught him these great qualities: the bible, *Pilgrim's*

progress, Aesop's fables, and *Robinson Crusoe.* We are told that every controversy, personal, professional, or political, had first to be tried out in the court of his conscience.

Following the discussion of the two fundamental passions of Lincoln's life come two chapters on Lincoln in politics. His career is described from 1832, when he became a candidate for the state legislature, through his one term in congress. The author lays emphasis upon the principles Lincoln maintained throughout his political career. Three chapters are devoted to a discussion of Lincoln the lawyer. The moral standards of his law practice were the same as those he had adopted for his private life, and to these principles he was faithful even when he became the leading lawyer of his state.

Two chapters are given to Lincoln the logician. Quoting Herndon that Lincoln had no faith in mere "say so's," the author proceeds to show how Lincoln developed the powers of logic which he displayed to such an eminent degree. First he always thought things out for himself, then distinguished between the essentials and nonessentials, and finally put his conclusions in the simplest language possible. This was the secret of Lincoln's logic. In the Lincoln-Douglas debates "his base was common sense, direct statement, and the inflexibility of logic." His great addresses whether in law, government, or politics were usually based upon some parable or proposition from the bible, some primary legal axiom, or political proposition from the declaration of independence.

It seems to be the universal opinion among men who have made a study of Lincoln's speeches that he was a master in the use of the English language. In a chapter on Lincoln's language the author says, "His oratory was not the oratory of expediency or opportunism; it was the oratory of the eternal reason and right of things." Lincoln had none of the natural oratorical endowments such as a rich voice or an attractive physique; instead, he was awkward and ungainly, with a falsetto voice. These disadvantages, however, were more than outweighed by the humanities of his head and heart. He was an "accurate and reliable interpreter of human nature and human needs."

Five of Lincoln's great speeches are printed in the book with little comment. The Gettysburg oration is an exception; in its case the author makes a careful analysis and produces a very interesting chapter. Two chapters are given to Lincoln the leader, in which those qualities emphasized in Rothchild's *Lincoln, master of men* are discussed. Lincoln's leadership stood "for measures rather than men, for causes rather than candidates, for principles rather than persons." The book closes with

chapters on "Lincoln on peace"; "Lincoln the most unselfish of men"; and Lincoln's views on religion, temperance, and labor.

Although the author deals with a much discussed subject, yet he has in the opinion of the reviewer made a book which is decidedly worth while. The style is conversational, and like Lincoln's own, simple and direct. The reviewer feels that Judge Wanamaker has amply vindicated his views in regard to the importance of the study of the character of Lincoln.

W. W. Sweet

Battle of Plattsburg: a study in and of the war of 1812. To remind our troops of the actions of their brave countryman, — General Macomb, in his report of the battle of Plattsburg. By John M. Stahl (Chicago: Van Trump company, 1918. 166 p. $1.00)

That such a book as this could be written in the face of almost numberless demonstrations of the fallacy of its thesis, illustrates anew the amazing incapacity of many seemingly intelligent minds to reason correctly or to distinguish truth from error. Mr. Stahl, an "ex-president of the Society of the War of 1812 in Illinois," is moved to indignation over the spectacle of the woful ignorance displayed by Americans with respect to the able and heroic manner in which their forbears waged the war of 1812. Chief responsibility for this sad state of affairs is ascribed to the fact that from New England, a section "early noted for its mental narrowness, its intolerance, its self-righteousness, and assumption of superior wisdom" has proceeded most of our public writing "including that labelled, and libelled, History." To proceed with the indictment, our children in the public and private schools are taught "almost or quite nothing" about the war of 1812, and "yet worse, what is taught is, in nearly every case, and particular, erroneous so far as it relates to the land engagements, and is unjust to . . . the brave soldiers of that War." Because of this "crime" committed against the soldiers of the war of 1812, they "are generally regarded as nearly always incompetent and very often cowardly" and the war itself as "insignificant in purpose and inconclusive and discreditable in results."

Truly a magnitudinous task has Mr. Stahl set himself. Let us note the historical method whereby he proceeds to unravel the long-concealed truth about the war of 1812. Chapter 2, on "Authorities," discloses it. Having read diligently "more than two score" books about the war (fearing, incidentally, that he "must be almost the only person that has read some of these books for many years") he finds that "the sooner after the War the book was written, the more valuable it is as history." It is true some of the early writers were prejudiced; "but they made

no effort to hide that prejudice. . . They were frankly, openly more concerned to make out their case than to state only the facts and all the facts.'' To get at the truth from these books is a task ''not only easy, but humanly certain, when one has before him, let us say, one book on each side.'' All he has to do is to ''guide his pen midway between the contending piles of statements, or, at times, veer a little to one side or the other of the middle line as is plainly indicated by the heat of the heady writers.''

To the reviewer, at least, this appears a remarkable discovery; so simple that one wonders why some of the many workers who are devoting their lives to the study of history should never have stumbled upon it. Notwithstanding the advantage its possession may be presumed to confer, however, Mr. Stahl makes sad work, on the whole, of his narrative of the war of 1812. He disclaims opposition to universal training, yet the whole effect of his study is to nullify this disclaimer and to create the impression that the raw American militia, hastily gathered from highways and byways, and dispersing thereto oftentimes with even greater haste, are the equals in combat of trained and disciplined regular soldiers. To this end he has chosen the battle of Plattsburg as affording the aptest illustration, and has devoted 160 pages to an account of it quite in keeping with the historical method which he himself describes. That Americans are brave, that given proper training, organization, and leadership they are the equal of any soldiers the world can produce, no one out of bedlam would think of disputing. A book written to prove this proposition is a waste of effort. That untrained, undisciplined, unequipped, and unorganized Americans are fit to stand in battle against the world's best soldiery is quite another proposition — one which, it might be supposed, no one not an inmate of bedlam would think of advancing.

The battle of Plattsburg is remarkable for several reasons. The most splendid British army ever sent to America, composed of Wellington's peninsular veterans, seeking to invade the United States turned back before a markedly inferior American force composed largely of raw levies. Well might America recount the story with pride, while to Britain it brings emotions of deepest shame. Does it follow, as our author blandly asserts, that ''the few days of actual training given them by Macomb had made these militia and volunteers as good soldiers as any in the world at that time''? The true explanation is quite otherwise. The facts remain, despite this volume written to obscure them, that the decisive factors in the battle of Plattsburg were the brilliant work of our own Macdonough and the mishandling of the British army by Sir George Prevost; and that Wellington's veterans were afforded no opportunity

to test their strength against Macomb's militia levies. In the naval battle, with no striking disparity between the forces engaged, the Americans won a sweeping victory. Through excess of caution which appears extraordinary in view of all the circumstances, Prevost thereupon gave over the campaign and retired with all practicable speed to Canada. That there was no real battle between the land forces is plainly evident from the casualties in the two armies. The loss of the British during the eight-day period ending September 14 was but 37 killed and 150 wounded. The American loss was likewise 37 killed, and 62 wounded. The outcome of the campaign was a disgrace to British annals; but the American militia were an almost negligible factor in the premises. The American soldier may well pray to be spared such apologists as the author of this book.

Invasion of the city of Washington. A disagreeable study in and of military unpreparedness. By John M. Stahl (Chicago: Van Trump company, 1918. 257 p. $1.00)

This book is an historical sermon under fifteen heads on the necessity of military and naval preparedness. The author has sought diligently through the scriptures of American history for texts and, in pursuing his narrative through 1814, has a good old-fashioned moral for the nation of today. Like most sermons the composition is rambling and subjective. The author zealously tries to do his bit to "make the world safe for democracy." Yet in view of the fact that the history of the war of 1812 is just now being rewritten under the auspices of the National security league, with the idea that the United States failed to see the real enemy and took the wrong side in that great war, is it not as well that the preparedness idea was not carried out efficiently in the pre-war period? After all can such a volume with its sweeping deductions make a serious claim to being "history"?

A. C. C.

Romance of old Philadelphia. By John T. Faris. (New York: J. B. Lippincott company, 1918. 336 p. $4.50 net)

Could the pioneer of early times have known how conspicuously he was to figure in the many compilations of the future, he would have been greatly perturbed and perchance written differently the early history of our country — not better perhaps but more conscientiously — probably in some respects less interestingly and picturesquely. At least he would have left more complete records of his doings.

The pioneers of Philadelphia may have guessed the importance their records were destined to have in later days; at any rate they left a generous storehouse.

No one who has visited the rooms of the Pennsylvania historical society and has seen the vast amount of material preserved there can help sharing Mr. Faris' impulse to draw forth the romance of the historical city which has left so rich and fascinating a record. Nor does the author of *The romance of old Philadelphia* seem to find any deficiency. His statement, "much of the materials for the volume has been gathered from manuscripts and genealogical records" and rare books found in the Pennsylvania historical society, assures for him a respectful hearing. None could delve there and fail to discover something of interest. And as Mr. Faris says, "because of the unique part played by Philadelphia in the history of the nation, the appeal made by the records of those who lived and labored, who loved and struggled there, has even more of general interest than a similar study of the pioneers of many other portions of the country."

As in similar works, an introductory chapter treats of the founding of the city; it is followed successively by chapters on housebuilding and homemaking, social life and recreation, early schools, religious and social customs, government, and the like. Throughout the sources are drawn on freely for quotation.

It is to be deplored that many of the chapters in several recent books on Philadelphia and Pennsylvania are practically repetitions. For instance, *Early Philadelphia,* by H. M. Lippincott, and the present work, *The romance of old Philadelphia,* both published by the same firm, are too much alike to justify both; neither have covered the field exhaustively, yet both have undoubted merit. When so much data is available, it would seem that a better scheme of publication would have been a scholarly compilation under the direction of one author, covering the ground in several volumes, rather than independent writers covering the same ground with needless repetition.

West Florida controversy, 1798-1813. A study in American diplomacy. By Isaac Joslin Cox, associate professor of history, University of Cincinnati. [Albert Shaw lectures on diplomatic history, 1912] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins press, 1918. 698 p. $3.00 net)

This book deals with the successive stages of the American seizure and occupation of Spanish West Florida in the period 1798 to 1813. It is prefaced by long introductory chapters dealing with the earlier history of the region under Spanish, French, and English control; then follows a detailed account of the diplomatic intrigue, the expansion of population into the southwest, the acts of border violence, the internal revolutions in West Florida, and finally a portrayal of the actual occupation. The relation of the pressure of the American frontier population upon the southwestern border is everywhere emphasized as the key-

note of the period. The Louisiana purchase and the Burr conspiracy are analyzed relative to the general southwestern situation and to the West Florida problem in particular. Such personalities as Governor Claiborne of Orleans territory and Governor Holmes of Mississippi territory, both of whom have been rescued from oblivion in recent years, are necessarily given a large place among the men and movements of the period.

The most outstanding impression conveyed to the reviewer is that of the successive despoiling of Spanish territory by a republican nation, under the leadership of so-called democratic statesmen. This chauvinistic aspect of the early years of American national history is so thoroughly established that, in the future, no reputable historian will be likely to risk his standing by attempting to obscure it. Jefferson and Madison have at last received their just deserts, so far as this phase of their record is concerned. Historians have long known that our methods and policies with reference to our weaker neighbors were not highly commendable. But the extent of the chicanery and crookedness involved in our effort to secure the coveted area is borne in on the mind of the reader in a forcible manner. The custodians of our nation in its youth vied with the old world politicians in duplicity and deceit. They did not even refuse to utilize known traitors to do their work (*vide* Wilkinson).

The book is the result of a careful, painstaking search of Spanish, French, and American archives. The chief sources are the *Papeles procedentes de Cuba,* in the *Archive general* at Seville, Spain, the diplomatic correspondence in the *Archives des affaires étrangeres* at Paris and in the *Archivo historico nacional* at Madrid. Extensive use was also made of the original letter-books of Governor W. C. C. Claiborne and other papers in the state department of archives and history at Jackson, Mississippi, the archives of the state and war departments at Washington, and the manuscript collections in the library of congress.

Quite possibly it is an ungrateful criticism to suggest that if the book before us had been compressed to about one-third its present length it would have reached a much wider public than it is ever likely to reach with its present dimensions. It is just this wide public that the book should reach, for it is an excellent piece of research on a subject that has long merited a close, scientific scrutiny. The compression suggested could well have been achieved without sacrificing any material points: many of the wearisome details could have been subordinated to appendices and notes where they would have been available for those who desired still further illustrative material. As it stands, however, the text is encumbered with too much unnecessary luggage,

On the other hand it must be noted that few errors seem to have been made. The few noted by the reviewer, evidently typographical for the most part, are too trivial for mention. The volume contains three sketch maps to illustrate the text, a copy of Sarby's "Map of the state of Louisiana," and a dependable index. There is no bibliography appended; this is regrettable, since one would like to know more about the sources.

C. E. Carter

Ohio in the time of the confederation. Edited with introduction and notes by Archer Butler Hulbert, professor of history, Marietta college. [Marietta college historical collections, volumes 2 and 3, Ohio company series, volumes 2 and 3] (Marietta, Ohio: Marietta historical commission, 1917. 227; 220 p. $5.00)

Two more volumes of the *Collections* of the Marietta historical commission, both issued in war time with the editor-in-chief in camp service, constitute a notable achievement. One must believe, however, that although the introductions were written at Camp Russell and Camp Travis respectively, the bulk of the work was accomplished in a scholar's study, for the thoroughness and detachment with which it is accomplished ill befit the corridors of Mars.

The second installment of the Ohio company records is even more interesting than those embodied in volume I, and suggests the activities of a town-meeting democracy combined with a touch of modern socialized state care. The agents and proprietors of the Ohio company even appeal to "the paternal tenderness of the Government of the United States" for assistance during the Indian wars. In illustration of their own "paternal tenderness" are to be noted the sums advanced for the "Relief Comfort and recovery" of the sick persons of the settlement, and the appropriation made for the purchase of amputating and trepanning instruments. Another form of relief was the proposal to send an agent to New York to secure $2,000 in cash "Solely for the purpose of Benefiting the Settlement by Loan to such Individuals as Stand in need of the Same." Also the resolution to loan the surplus funds of the company at the then very low rate of six per cent interest "to the assisting such Worthy industrious Persons as wish, but are unable to remove to this Country." Another instance of the humanity of the directors was the proposal to set aside a reserve a mile square upon the Muskingum for the Indian chief Cornplanter, formerly an enemy, who had become an ally of the American government. For some reason Cornplanter never took advantage of this offer of a grant, but lived and died on his reserve on the upper Allegheny, above the present town of Warren, Pennsylvania. A significant entry in the records is the appoint-

ment in December, 1795, of a committee to sell the four blockhouses around Campus Martius, since at the treaty of Greenville, the preceding August, the Indians of the northwest had promised to abandon their attacks upon the American settlements.

There is little about the orderly progress of the Ohio company that suggests the usual turbulent frontier settlements by which most of the west was peopled. One of the first arrangements was for preaching service, and as all the world knows adequate reserves of land were set aside for educational and religious purposes. Early plans were made for garden lots; and for all the streets and public squares shade trees were purchased, the lessees being required "to seed them to grass." Even the Indian mounds came in for their share of attention, since January 20, 1796, it is recorded: "Whereas the great Mound falls within the Line of the Ministry Lot (so-called): Resolved, unanimously, as the sense of this Meeting that every prudent measure ought to be adopted to perpetuate the figure and appearance of so majestic a Monument of Antiquity." Would that more frontier communities had had a similar sense of the responsibility of their stewardship — American archaeology might thereby have been immeasurably enriched.

It would be interesting to remark upon arrangements for the Nova Scotians and the French from the Scioto company's unfortunate settlement, but enough has been said to show the value of the records, in which each reader can find something to appeal to his own interest. Great care has been taken and a deserved success attained in making the index, which will prove of considerable genealogical and historical value. The footnotes are, however, no more expanded than those of volume I; on page 213 a note upon Alexander Hamilton's connection with the company seems to have been inadvertently omitted.

Volume III of the *Collections* is less homogeneous in character than its two predecessors, which indeed it precedes in point of time. It is entitled *Ohio in the time of the confederation*, but might well be designated the "Genesis of the ordinance of 1787." It is divided into three parts: first, reprints from sources not easily accessible; second, previously unpublished papers of the continental congress; third, an original journal of John Matthews, one of the surveyors of the "seven ranges" in 1786. Again, as in volume I of the *Collections*, the editor has given an illuminating and careful analysis of the succeeding documents and has brought into informing antithesis the Ohio company's ordered plans for western settlement and the "large body of eager lusty pioneers, supreme in their disdain of the surly Indians, unique in their strong sense of democracy, crowding the Ohio's shores." Of such contrasts is our history composed, and from such elements have arisen our virile

forces of today. Such suggestive and far reaching discussions as Mr. Hulbert's reveal the very stuff of which our western civilization is made, and the warp and woof of its weaving.

A few omissions and misprints are not enough to mar the lasting value of the volume. On page xxx it is not difficult to guess that the author wrote "a renunciation of the right of seceding" not of "ceding." On page 164 "Captain Thomas Swearingen" should be Captain Van Swearingen, father-in-law of Samuel Brady, and himself a hero of the border. Other Ohio valley pioneers, such as Colonel David Shepard, Joseph Tomlinson and Major William McMahon [McMecham] are not noted at all. Neither is the term "Indian Wheeling Creek" explained, a curious title prefixed to many Ohio affluents on the northern or Indian bank of the great river. These are, however, inconsiderable blemishes in an otherwise valuable book, for which future students of American origins may well be grateful.

L. P. K.

Illinois and Michigan canal. A study in economic history. By James William Putnam, Ph.D., professor of economics, Butler college. [Chicago historical society's collections, vol. X.] (Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1918. 213 p. $2.00 net)

Naturally we welcome this thorough treatment of a subject which is receiving a new lease of life with the present increased interest in water communication between the great lakes and the gulf. Following a very clear frontispiece map of Illinois showing the route of the proposed canals the author gives the historical origin of the project relating it to the numerous efforts to secure improved connections of the various sections of the Mississippi valley with the Atlantic seaboard. Chapter two presents very concisely the account of the efforts to finance and construct the particular project. After another detailed chapter of the management of the construction one reaches the fourth and in many ways most interesting chapter of all, that which undertakes to disclose the economic influence of the canal. Here the work truly evidences the too oft disclosed characteristic features of the doctoral dissertation. While giving a very valuable summary of the economic history of a considerable portion of the state of Illinois the author claims too much for his pet canal. It is very doubtful if any one can be sure that the reported increased values in real estate were due as claimed to the canal. The chapter nevertheless is a valuable history of the economic development of Chicago and of the section along the route of the projected canal. This chapter is also enriched by valuable pictures and tables among which is one of the original town of Chicago of 1830 and another of Chicago harbor in 1849. The different efforts to improve and enlarge the canal

are well given in the next chapter. A very brief and satisfactory conclusion of five pages sums up all that the general reader need ever know about this never overwhelmingly important undertaking. So thoroughly satisfactory is this treatment in general that the volume will doubtless become the authority on the subject.

R. B. Way

An English settler in pioneer Wisconsin. Edited with introduction and notes by Milo M. Quaife, superintendent of the society. [Publications of the state historical society of Wisconsin, Collections, volume XXV] (Madison: State historical society of Wisconsin, 1918. 250 p.)

In this volume we have a first-rate example of scholarly editing. "In general," says Mr. Quaife in his preface, "the original manuscript is reproduced verbatim. In a few cases obviously inadvertent and meaningless errors of the writer have not been reproduced in print. Commonly, however, such errors have been reproduced, accompanied, where deemed advisable, by the editor's interpretation printed in brackets. The original letters are without paragraphing; for this feature of them as printed the editor is, therefore, responsible. With respect to capitalization and punctuation, the original manuscript has been carefully followed, with one important qualification. In the manuscript the sentences commonly run into one another without any indication of the close of one and the opening of a succeeding sentence. For the convenience of the reader, in such cases, the transition point between sentences has been indicated by the introduction of the spacing known to typesetters and proofreaders as the quad. To do this involved the frequent application of an editorial interpretation, not necessarily infallible, of the manuscript. However, the careful student who wishes to see the copy, with respect to this matter, just as it runs in the original manuscript, may do so by the simple process of ignoring these printers' quads."

The preliminary information needed by the reader is set forth in a not too extensive historical introduction, in which the editor tells the life story of Edwin Bottomley in so far as it concerns the letters and gives the story and the letters their proper historical setting. The story is told in such a way that we wish to know more about Edwin Bottomley and turn to the letters with interest.

The writer of the letters was a typical middle class English emigrant of the first half of the nineteenth century, a native of Mossley, England, born in 1809, who early became a designer of patterns in a mill; having married in 1829, in 1842 he emigrated to America in quest of opportunities for his children more promising than he had been able to find in the homeland. He settled in Racine county, Wisconsin, near the site

of the present city of Racine. Today one hundred and seventy living descendants, engaged in a great variety of occupations, are scattered over Wisconsin and states farther west.

The letters are from son to father, and begin with the voyage to America. They cover eight years, to Edwin Bottomley's death in 1850, and narrate in great detail his career in the land of promise. With but few exceptions the letters have been preserved. The father carefully kept them in the family archives in England until his own migration to the Wisconsin homestead, whence they found their way into the custody of the State historical society of Wisconsin in 1914.

The editor's comments upon the importance of the papers does credit to his democracy. He points out that while in 1809, *annus mirabilis,* were born Lincoln, Darwin, Gladstone, there was but one each of these, while there were millions of Edwin Bottomleys, humble, hard-working, God-fearing, who in their aggregate have been a more potent force in history than any of the chosen few. They stand for the sacrifice of fathers and mothers for their children, the sturdy character, the disciplined powers, the hopeful outlook, and the will to endure hardships, which have contributed to make America.

Footnotes are few, as the text is largely self-explanatory. A brief appendix contains an interesting document, "An address from the inhabitants of the English settlement, Wisconsin, United States of America, to their friends in England, on behalf of the erection of a new chapel." Several well-chosen illustrations aid the text, and a good index is supplied.

G. N. Fuller

History of economic legislation in Iowa. By Ivan L. Pollock. [Iowa economic history series, edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh] (Iowa City: State historical society of Iowa, 1918. 386 p.)

In this compilation of economic legislation enacted in Iowa, Mr. Pollock has made a distinct contribution to the increasing literature with respect to the practical solution of public economic problems. The volume corresponds in the Iowa economic series to the useful *History of social legislation in Iowa* by Mr. Briggs in the Iowa social history series. In view of the broad powers of the state to legislate for the general welfare of the people, there is ample justification for this review of "the economic legislation of a typical State of the Middle West" in order to show "just what that State has done in this interesting field of governmental direction and control."

In limiting the scope of the present work Mr. Pollock defines economic legislation as "legislation enacted for the purpose of bettering and protecting the economic condition of the people of the State." According-

ly, he excludes all legislation guided by ethical rather than economic considerations, and includes the history of laws relating to transportation, agriculture and stock raising, mines and mining, conservation and internal improvements, general corporations, insurance, banking, building and loan associations, trade and commerce, labor, the power of municipal corporations in enacting economic legislation, and taxation.

The volume presents a comprehensive account of the economic legislation in Iowa, which, beginning as almost a primitive wilderness, has developed into one of the most prosperous states in the middle west. A typically American population, engaged predominantly in agricultural pursuits, the people of Iowa have shown a sturdy common sense in the solution of their public economic problems. The progress made has been slow but steady. Laws once passed have been amended with care, and in contrast to the radicalism of so many other commonwealths, Iowa has shown a marked conservatism in the passage of economic legislation of a practical rather than a theoretical type. The history of this economic legislation constantly illustrates the conflict between reactionary and progressive tendencies, between decentralizing and centralizing influences, that is usually characteristic of state government.

Only a few of the more striking features of economic legislation in Iowa can be noted. The struggle to secure good roads was marked by the usual conflict between progressive and reactionary tendencies. Finally a law was enacted which, by establishing a state highway commission, provided for a more centralized control over roads and bridges. The history of railway legislation is typical of the middle west. First came a period of construction, in which strong inducements were offered to secure the greatly needed railroads. Next was a period of reaction, 1870 to 1878, marked by numerous regulations, and followed by the creation of a railroad commission with only advisory power. Finally, a board of railroad commissioners was created in 1888 with broad regulatory power.

Iowa, as an essentially rural state, has passed a number of laws relating to agriculture, all of them either of an educational or a protective nature. No laws have been passed directly affecting production, and the result has been to further agricultural interests while preserving the American spirit of self-dependence. A similar spirit has been shown in dealing with corporations, in the passage of laws that protect the public but do not attempt to set forth the utopian schemes of theoretical reformers. Of special interest is the Iowa "blue sky law" passed in 1913 in order to stop the sale of fraudulent securities. Unfortunately the federal courts declared this law unconstitutional, but another act was passed in 1915 which will, it is hoped, accomplish the same end.

The history of fiscal legislation in Iowa is also of interest in view of the present widespread agitation for tax reform in other states of the middle west, which, like Iowa, have discovered that a system of taxation designed originally for a sparsely settled rural community does not meet modern demands. The fundamental principles of the Iowa system of taxation, according to Mr. Pollock, include: "the ad valorem principle of listing property, the assessment of general property by township, town, or city, and township, County and State review or equalization." This system has remained practically unchanged throughout the entire period of the state's history and has become thoroughly unsatisfactory, inasmuch as many changes are necessary to secure "equality or uniformity and universality of taxation." So far the legislature has refused to enact into law the recommendations of special tax commissions created in 1893 and 1911.

Necessarily this history of economic legislation contains many details, yet the style is clear, with much analysis, and the historical background is not ignored. A more extended account of the practical working of these laws would have been desirable, but the space available precluded such discussion. An excellent feature of the book is the extensive use, at the end of chapters, of summaries; these are of much assistance to the casual reader. For more intensive study there are numerous references to the different statutes and to illustrative material, while there is also a comprehensive index. The volume should prove of special value in legislative reference libraries; it is, in fact, indispensable for the study of the practical solution of the economic problems of state government.

B. W. Bond, Jr.

Spirit lake massacre. By Thomas Teakle. (Iowa City: State historical society of Iowa, 1918. 336 p.)

This is a beautifully printed book of 336 pages giving the history of the Spirit lake massacre of 1857. Offhand one might be disposed to think that an affair so isolated and obscure as this tragic event could not reasonably command as extensive a narrative as Mr. Teakle has supplied. One who reads the book, however, will hardly be disposed to make this criticism. The narrative is not too extensive adequately to trace the whole sad story of the conditions leading up to the massacre, the event itself, and the subsequent captivity and fortunes of the parties concerned in it. Whether Mr. Teakle has apportioned the space at his disposal to the best advantage is another question. There are approximately seventy thousand words, divided into thirty-one chapters. Some of these are but half a dozen pages in length while their average length is about 2250 words. Notwithstanding the length of the narrative as a whole, one gets the impression that some of the chapter discussions are

sketchy and superficial. On the other hand the author's style is easy and agreeable, and he seems to manage with skill the many threads of his narrative.

The Spirit lake massacre stands in much the same relation to Iowa as the Black Hawk war of a quarter of a century earlier does to Illinois and Wisconsin. From the military point of view both were insignificant. But in each case the result of the uprising was to remove forever from the state or states in question the Indian as a factor in the determination of its affairs and to open to the advance of white occupation, far more rapidly than would otherwise have been the case, the region more directly affected. Certain other features also the two affairs have in common. In neither event was the Indian without provocation or the white race free from fault and wrongdoing. Indeed, to the reviewer, among the saddest chapters in Mr. Teakle's book are those portraying the injustice meted out to the Indian by the whites and the ineffectiveness of the government's measures to insure fair treatment. In both cases, too, the fact that the outbreaks were the last of their kind in their respective regions has caused them to loom larger in the imagination of after generations than would otherwise have been the case.

The work is well done on the whole, but attention is called to two omissions, one of minor, the other of major importance. The first concerns the absence of illustrations. There must have been a wealth of these available; since the work is a secondary narrative, obviously designed for general reading, the inclusion of a reasonable number of pertinent illustrations would have added materially to the attractiveness of the volume. More serious, however, is the neglect to provide a suitable outline map showing the geography of the extensive region with which the narrative deals, and the location with respect to one another of the many places mentioned, together with the routes of the numerous journeys or marches that figure in the story. The writer chances to be a native of Iowa and tolerably familiar with the geography of the region involved in the narrative, but even so, the aid of a suitable map would have added much to its lucidity in perusal. For the reader who does not enjoy the accidental advantage the reviewer chances to possess, the aid of such a map would seem to be far more essential. We believe such aids to the proper understanding by the reader of his work should be afforded as a matter of course by the historical editor or author.

History of Missouri. By Eugene Morrow Violette, professor of history, state normal school Missouri. (New York: D. C. Heath and company, 1918. 500 p.)

Treatment of state history from a new point of view is found in Mr. Violette's work. The purpose of the author, as is clearly set forth in

his introductory note, is "to deal with only those topics in Missouri history that have significance in the history of the nation." Although the correlation of state and national history is the purpose of the book, Mr. Violette has also succeeded in compiling the best single volume on the general history of Missouri. The work was written for use in the high schools and is, therefore, a textbook in style and arrangement.

The book is divided into twenty-three chapters covering 466 pages. It has a bibliography of general and special works and a carefully compiled index. At the end of each chapter is given a topical bibliography; at the beginning of the chapter is a short statement of the historical setting in national history which is the subject for application to Missouri history. This treatment is carried out throughout the book.

Mr. Violette has, as a rule, attempted to discuss only those subjects on which there is reasonably reliable secondary material. A work of this nature would not permit its author to do original investigation to any extent. In respect to his secondary authorities the author has been fortunate in the main. Little more than a decade past there were few scholarly monographs on Missouri history. The increase since that time has not been prolific but it has assumed fair proportions. Through the efforts of the departments of political science and American history at the university of Missouri and of the officers and members of the State historical society of Missouri, at Columbia, there has been built up a loyal and enthusiastic group of men who are interested in Missouri history and who are authors of scholarly monographs. Among these are such authors as Isidor Loeb, Jonas Viles, Walter B. Stephens, H. A. Trexler, C. H. McClure, Thomas S. Barclay, the Bibliographer, William C. Breckenridge, and others. Mr. Violette has availed himself of these as well as of the general and special works that have appeared; he has not omitted any important work bearing on his subject.

If any criticism of this work could be made it would lie against those few chapters on which the author could obtain little information from secondary material. If Missouri history down to 1821 demands 139 pages, the treatment of events after 1870 demands more than 43 pages. The economic and social life of Missourians changed after 1870. The problems connected with urban communities, city government, industrial life, corporation functioning, the granger movements, state support of educational and elemosynary institutions, broadening of official public policies, — these important problems have had their great growth in Missouri since 1870. Perhaps the coming decade will see a new set of monographs compiled that will throw light in these modern questions.

In several chapters the author has either been obliged to select for his historical setting subjects that bear little relation to the reading matter

in the chapter, or he has not selected his historical setting with accuracy. Such failures in the correlation of national and state history are noticeable. For example, chapter v, "Conditions in Missouri during the territorial period," has for its historical setting "The Missouri compromise." This identical historical setting is also, but properly, the historical setting of chapter vi, "The struggle of Misssouri for statehood." This error is also found in chapter vii, "Early banking in Missouri," which has for its historical setting the "Panic of 1837." One of the most apparent failures, however, is seen in chapter ix, "Missouri and the far west," which treats of Missouri as a consistent colonizer and developer of the far west from the early traders of St. Louis in the eighteenth century down through the era of Missouri river steamboat navigation to the building of the railroads over the plains and the attempted revival of river traffic in 1912. The historical setting of this chapter is "The war between the United States and Mexico," which is also made to serve as the historical setting of chapter viii, "Expeditions of Kearney and Doniphan."

It seems difficult to make this correlation plan work comprehensively enough to include all the subjects of state history that an author regards as important and which really are important from a state point of view. It is also hard to understand how some of these state topics are "significant in the history of the nation." In most of the cases met with where Mr. Violette has not "pegged" his chapter accurately, a new edition could easily remedy the error by a different historical setting. Few chapters are included that should be dispensed with.

These criticisms on correlation may be partly misdirected if the subject of the historical setting was intended merely to guide the teacher in his regular course of study in national history. If the historical setting indicates only the "stepping-stone" from the American history work to the state history reading, it would not perhaps be so material to have the correlation identical in subject matter. An examination of this feature of the book inclines one to assume that the author labored in attempting to solve two problems, — the *historian's* correlation problem as stated in the introduction and the *teacher's* problem of transition from national to state history. If this last was the author's main intention, an introductory note for the guidance of the teacher as well as the one for the general reader and historian would be helpful.

The work is well printed and the mechanism is good. A glance shows the labor given by the author to its compilation. While the reviewer has not attempted to check all statements of fact in a volume so comprehensive, the work seems reliable and shows care in preparation. Moreover, the author has not indulged in those over-laudatory praises of his com-

monwealth that lessen the value of many state histories. As a general text on Missouri it is the best that has been compiled.

F. C. Shoemaker

Nebraska state historical society, *Publications.* Volume xviii. Edited by Albert Watkins, historian of the society. (Lincoln: Nebraska state historical society, 1917. 448 p. $2.50)

For some years past the society publishing the above volume has been omitting from its publications all reports of the proceedings of the organization. With the advent of a new secretary it now returns to its old-time practice with the result that over one-half of the present volume is devoted to a more or less abridged record of its proceedings for the past nine years. Biographical, historical, and "special historical" papers and index occupy the remaining 219 pages, the whole being accompanied by eleven full-page illustrations. Among the general historical papers, "A rural mail carrier of 1849" and "Trailing Texas long horn cattle through Nebraska" are two with large appeal to the student of frontier or midwestern history. The three "special" papers are all of general as well as local interest. The two by Mr. Watkins, historian of the society, are splendid examples of critical handling of exceedingly difficult material, although their involved style will render some portions of them difficult of understanding to the average reader. The reviewer feels that clearness and continuity would have been gained by placing Mr. Webster's paper on "Controversy in the senate over the admission of Nebraska" after, instead of between, Mr. Watkins' papers on "Neapolis, near-capital" and "How Nebraska was brought into the union." Somewhat novel, but apparently justified, is the statement by Mr. Watkins that during the territorial period "popular opinion commonly prevailed in Kansas while it was commonly disregarded and subjugated in Nebraska." An occasional typographical error has escaped the proofreader, as, for example, "is" for "it" in line 18 on page 383. While the index to the volume is unusually extensive, it is somewhat uneven in composition; for example, under the heading "Annexation of South Platte section to Kansas," reference is made to one discussion of the subject on page 308, but none is made to the more important one on page 377. The volume as a whole is nevertheless fully up to the standard set by the society in recent years, and is well worthy of its place on the shelves of either the library or the individual aspiring to any extensive collection of materials upon the history of the plains west.

C. E. Persinger

Spanish and French rivalry in the gulf region of the United States, 1678-1702. The beginnings of Texas and Pensacola. By William Edward Dunn, instructor in Latin-American history, University of Texas. [*University of Texas Bulletin*, number 1705, Studies in history, number 1] (Austin: University of Texas, 1917. 238 p.)

The period covered by this dissertation lies almost wholly within the reign of Charles II, "the Bewitched," who in 1665 came to the throne a weakling child of four years and ruled until harried into the peace of the grave by the French and Austrian rivalry over succession to his barren kingdom. While Louis XIV was alternately dismembering and restoring the provinces of Spain in Europe, a futile attempt at colonial expansion on the littoral of the Gulf of Mexico proved a feeble echo of the great deeds of conquest of the preceding century. Spain was reduced to an amoeboid expansion, reacting only to the irritation of a foreign element intruded within her colonial periphery. If frontiers widened, it was due to local initiative rather than to central will and planning.

In 1678 the Spanish sovereignty over North America, diminished through acquiescence (by the treaty of 1670) in English occupation of Jamaica and the Atlantic coast south to the Savanna river, had yet to meet a more vaguely defined menace of further diminution through French expansion from Canada. The Spanish holdings in North America were smaller than the present republic of Mexico save for precarious tenure of the widely separated regions of New Mexico and Florida. Between the French, the English, and the Spanish, lay the great interior, its unmeasured distances relied upon for protection to the great silver-bearing province of Nueva Vizcaya. In New Mexico the governor, Diego de Peñalosa, had in the early sixties come into conflict with the inquisition over questions of jurisdiction and of the faith, and had been punished by loss of civil rights and by exile. In vengeance, he plotted to seize for France the ill-defined Indian kingdoms of Teguayo and Quivira, together with the mineral lands of Nueva Vizcaya. His proposal only redounded to the advantage of La Salle, and served to arouse Spanish interest anew in the frontier.

La Salle, returning to France in 1684 from his voyage down the Mississippi in 1682, proposed the conquest of the region between his establishment on the Illinois river and Nueva Vizcaya. During the ensuing year he planted his doomed fort just inland from Matagorda bay, on Garcitas creek. Rumors of this came to New Spain from a captured pirate, and expeditions were sent from Spain and Vera Cruz to oust the intruder. The Catholic James II of England, carefully handled by the Spanish ambassador, was induced to discourage France from active

support of the Louisiana project, so rendering inevitable the failure which starvation, plague, and murder had already wrought. The Spaniards, unwitting of the disaster, sent in all eleven expeditions, by land and by sea, against the French fort. The land expeditions, initiated in Nuevo León, Coahuila, Nueva Vizcaya, and Florida, resulted in the final discovery of the abandoned fort and of survivors living among the Indians. The presence of these intruders served as impetus to exploration from Nuevo León as far as the Red river. Paucity of resource and fatuous confidence in distance as a safeguard led to a plan of defense based on influence over the Indians by establishment of missions among the Texas. The sea expeditions, from Vera Cruz, Havana, and Spain, led to the rediscovery of and the proposal to fortify Pensacola bay as the second feature of the desired frontier defenses.

But the mission plan was wrecked on the rock of Indian intractability and San Francisco de los Tejas was abandoned in 1694, while the fortification of Pensacola, finally effected in 1698 after years of inaction, came only as response to renewed French menace in the colonial enterprise of D'Iberville, who had located his initial establishment at Biloxi, where it remained a year before the Spanish discovered it.

Meantime the Scots colony at Darien, threatening the center of Spain's existence in America, diverted the attention of the royal and the colonial governments from the French menace. Pensacola was left in dire straits for men and provisions, while unfounded rumors of English designs to occupy Mobile further complicated matters. Happily the situation was relieved by the voluntary abandonment of the Darien project. When the commandant at Pensacola discovered the French at Biloxi, however, he was obliged by his wretched circumstances to limit action to verbal protest against the invasion and to accept gracefully the enemy's proffer of food for his starving men before returning to his miserable station.

Following the accession of Philip V to the throne, the Bourbons held before Spanish eyes the portent of England as a menace to French and Spanish colonial existence. Louis XIV insisted that France, the stronger of the two powers, should control Louisiana. The Spanish Junta de Guerra, demurring, was sharply reprimanded by Philip. Mobile was occupied by the French in 1702 as a check to the English, the Spanish court acquiescing.

Briefly, the foregoing is the connected story which Mr. Dunn contributes to the history of colonial expansion in North America. It is drawn almost entirely from Spanish documents, in the use of which the author has had exceptional experience and training and from which he draws with skill and discrimination. Many of the outstanding incidents treated

have been dealt with separately by numerous writers on early Texas history, especially Garrison, Clark, Bolton, and their students; these incidents have been amplified in the present work, and their mutual relations clarified and knit into a consecutive whole. The French side of the rivalry is not touched save in the most general outline.

Without conscious emphasis, but with understanding, the monograph lays bare the prostration of the Spanish court under the last Hapsburg, and the irresolution and fear which were the keynotes of its colonial policy until these were superseded by subservience to the Bourbon combination. The study of colonial institutions at work, while occasionally heavy with the author's consciousness of abundant documentation, is as clear as it is essential to adequate understanding of the institutions. The narrative is preliminary to a promised account of Spanish-French relations during the period of their futile alliance for the purpose of checking the English.

The book has a good index; the editing is careful and consistent. The "List of printed works cited" is necessarily brief, but the "List of manuscripts" is correspondingly long. Several tracings of Spanish maps hitherto unpublished appear. A general map of the gulf and frontier areas should have been compiled and included. Minor defects of presentation and form do not affect the permanent value of the contribution, which is assured a high place among the specialized writings on our colonial history.

H. I. Priestley

Back from hell. By Samuel Cranston Benson. (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and company, 1918. 250 p. $1.30)

Mr. Benson was a pacifist pastor in Patton, Pennsylvania, who conceived the somewhat curious design of going to Belgium to serve humanity, although the issues of the great war and the respective merits of the German, Belgian, French, and other causes were alike a matter of indifference to him. In forty-three chapters and 250 pages he relates his experiences in war-ridden Europe, the net result of which was to transform him from a pacifist of the extreme type into an ardent upholder of the virtue of helping the French put the fear of God into the Germans. The book is cheaply printed by the publishers, and equipped with a paper jacket as lurid as its title. Mr. Benson's style is distinctly journalistic, his observations and reflections are commonplace. If it be literature at all, it is literature of a distinctly ephemeral type.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Plans are rapidly nearing completion for the twelfth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association to be held at St. Louis, Missouri, May 8 to 10, 1919. The chairman of the program committee, Mr. Herbert A. Kellar, of the Cyrus H. McCormick library, Chicago, Illinois, has secured promises from several very able scholars to present papers, and the program bids fair to be attractive and well balanced. The committee on local arrangements, of which Mr. John H. Gundlach is chairman, has been assured a hearty coöperation on the part of the Missouri historical society and Washington university; both institutions have handsome buildings which will afford convenient meeting places. The usual courtesies, such as luncheons and automobile rides, will be extended.

The dates were selected as near as possible to May 11, the one hundredth anniversary of the arrival in St. Louis of the first steamboat, the *Independence*. The celebration of this occasion will mark the inauguration of a series planned for the centennial of Missouri's admission into the union.

A convention in the interests of Mississippi valley foreign trade was held at New Orleans on January 13 and 14, 1919. The theme for discussion, as announced, was "Promotion of Mississippi valley foreign trade and securing more adequate steamship facilities via gulf ports," with a view to promoting steamship facilities from gulf ports to the markets of Mexico, Central and South America, the orient, Australia, Africa, and Europe. A series of papers covering the subject in all its phases were read by experts in the field, opening a new interest for the Mississippi valley.

The German war code, by James Wilford Garner, has recently made its appearance as one of a series of University of Illinois *Bulletins,* under the direction of the university war committee.

Bennet Copplestone's *The silent watchers* (New York: E. P. Dutton and company, 1918. 342 p. $2.00) is written in the eulogistic strain of the man whose admiration for a subject does not dull with close familiarity. It is a glowing record of England's navy during the great war, written by a man who "knows the navy and loves it with his whole soul." It is just this blind devotion that detracts from the merit of the

work. The author forgets his own aphorism that the "navy hates advertisement and scorns above all things in heaven or upon earth the indiscriminate praise of well-meaning civilians." Mr. Copplestone's style is smooth, the narrative straightforward, often terse, the action easily handled.

Democracy and the great war is an historical outline prepared by George N. Fuller, secretary of the Michigan historical commission, for use in public schools. It covers references in a wide field of books and articles, and is supplemented by a series of essays which discuss many phases of the war — political, industrial, and social.

Admirably suited to the psychology of war but on too exalted a plane for the workaday peace world is the collection of poems, songs, and addresses called *The spirit of democracy,* edited by Lyman and Gertrude Powell (New York: Rand McNally and company, 1918. 272 p.). It introduces to its readers the utterances of men who, carried away by patriotic enthusiasm, voiced noble and stirring ideas; and yet, if the truth be told, most of them have since the signing of the armistice carefully sidestepped the issues which they saw so clearly during the storm and stress of war. The book, edited for school use, lacks depth — the selections introduced are all of the same nature. It falls short of its purpose, as stated on the title-page: "Patriotism through literature." For in the words of Charles Evans Hughes, who is given a hearing in its pages, "we want something more than thrills in our patriotism — we want thought." The book furnishes the thrills, but is eminently lacking in thought.

Albert H. Lybyer, of the University of Illinois, who has been making historical surveys of the Bulgarian situation under Colonel House, is now continuing his work at Versailles.

The Historical society of East and West Baton Rouge has elected H. L. Garrett secretary-treasurer, to succeed William O. Scroggs, who resigned to accept a position with the shipping board.

Attention has been called to the first three volumes of historical collections published by the Joseph Habersham chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, of Atlanta, Georgia. The volumes contain much genealogical material, bits of county and local history, transcripts from court records, and the like.

The western branch of the American oriental society held its annual meeting at the University of Illinois, February 28 to March 1. The meeting of the society was devoted to a symposium on reconstruction in the orient, especially with reference to the work done by its members.

The president of the American oriental society this year is J. H. Breasted of the University of Chicago. The officers of the western branch are Julian Morgenstern of Hebrew Union college, president, and A. T. Olmstead, University of Illinois, secretary-treasurer.

A check list of collections of personal papers in historical societies, universities and public libraries compiled by the library of congress, although by no means complete, forms a valuable index of many important historical collections in this country.

The August, 1918, *Hispanic American historical review* contains a discussion by William Spence Robertson of "The recognition of the Hispanic American nations by the United States," and an article on "Bolívar and the United States" by William R. Shepherd.

In the *Bulletin des recherches historiques* for November and December, 1918, may be found an interesting article entitled "Le projet de conquête de la Nouvelle-York de M. de Callières en 1689." Two other items of interest in the November issue are "Les arpenteurs de Montréal au XVIII siècle," and "L'esclavage au Canada sous le régime anglais."

The "Journal of Jonathan Russell, 1818-1819" is an original document reprinted in full in the *Massachusetts historical society* for May-June, 1918. It comprises a very interesting account of a trip through continental Europe, giving an intimate glimpse of Europe of a century ago, notably Sweden, France, Italy, and Austria. The student of European history will find here a valuable contemporary picture of the social and cultural life of the period.

A contribution to the bibliography of agriculture in Virginia, the latest bulletin of the Virginia state library, is a carefully compiled list of source and secondary material bearing on the history of agriculture in Virginia. The sources date back to Virginia as a colony. The first letter mentioned is one written by John Rolfe in 1616. Articles in the *American farmer*, 1819-1834, and in the early numbers of the *Richmond Enquirer*, as well as extracts from the writings of Washington are among the sources used by the compiler, Earl J. Swem.

A narrative sketch of the activities of the State historical society of Iowa in war times, by Benjamin F. Shambaugh, comprises the December issue of *Iowa and war.*

Major Godfrey de Linctot, who assisted George Rogers Clark in conquering the northwest, is the subject of a sketch by George A. Brennan in the latest number of the *Journal* of the Illinois state historical so-

ciety. "Historical notes on Lawrence county, Illinois," "Reminiscences of Lake Forest academy," and the "Early history of Pleasant Hill, McLean county, Illinois" complete the articles of historical interest in the issue.

The middle west, so rich in historical material of Catholic association, is to be the subject of study of the *St. Louis Catholic historical review*, a new publication which made its initial appearance in October, 1918. Catholic St. Louis, "the Rome of the West," dates its beginnings to 1541, when Hernando De Soto erected a cross on "a high hill" in its vicinity. In the succeeding centuries its historical importance has not waned. The quarterly, which is published by the Catholic historical society of St. Louis under the able editorship of the Reverend Charles L. Souvay, will be sure to interest historians of the Mississippi valley.

The December issue of the *Wisconsin magazine of history* contains a sketch of Alfred Brunson, a pioneer of Wisconsin Methodism, by his daughter, Ella C. Brunson. Another interesting article is that by Louise P. Kellogg, entitled "The Hudson company tokens."

The war, far from limiting the historical activities of the State historical society of Wisconsin, has widened and expanded its field of labor. The accessions to the library have been characterized by what Mr. M. M. Quaife, its superintendent, calls "a healthy growth." Over 400,000 titles, including books, pamphlets and newspapers, were added during the year ending in September, 1917. Among important documentary material may be listed photographic copies of material in the archives of the Indies at Seville which throws additional light on Spanish activities in the Mississippi valley. The Lapham papers, another recent accession, will prove useful in the interpretation of pioneer Wisconsin.

Historia, published by the Oklahoma historical society, makes its bow on January 1, 1919, in a gossipy number, devoted to light reminiscences of the past year, a sketch entitled "Among the Osages," which although it covers seven columns is little more than an extended notice of the Roddy family, a brief account of the doings of the society, and a list of the recent accessions to the library.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE YEAR 1916-1917

PROCEEDINGS

OF

THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

VOLUME IX, PART II

FOR

THE YEAR 1916-1917

THE TORCH PRESS
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA
1918

COPYRIGHT 1918 BY
THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

EDITOR'S PREFACE

The Mississippi valley historical association held two meetings during the year 1916-1917. The tenth annual meeting took place in Chicago, April 26-28, 1917. Of the twenty-two papers read at the sessions, six are here printed in full and sixteen are printed by title only, with references to where they have been or are to be published. Abstracts of all these papers will be found, however, in the account of the annual meeting. The other meeting, which came first in point of time, was the customary December gathering in connection with the meeting of the American historical association, held this year in Cincinnati. An account of this meeting will be found in the report of the secretary-treasurer, and abstracts of the papers read at the joint session on December 29 are printed in the *American historical review* for April, 1917 (p. 526). Three of these papers are here printed by title.

In accordance with the plan announced in the PROCEEDINGS for 1915-1916, this issue is designated as part II of volume IX and is paged consecutively with part I, the expectation being that the next two or three issues will be included in the same volume, the last to contain an index for the whole.

The association is again indebted to Mr. Beverley W. Bond, Jr., of Purdue university for the preparation of the account of the annual meeting, which will be recognized as no small task when the number of papers to be abstracted is taken into consideration. In the preparation of copy for the printer and the reading of the proofs the editor has had the assistance of Miss Franc Potter and Miss Jeannette Saunders of the editorial staff of the Minnesota historical society.

SOLON J. BUCK

MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY
ST. PAUL

The Board of Editors of The Mississippi Valley Historical Association

WALTER L. FLEMING
JAMES A. JAMES
SOLON J. BUCK
LAWRENCE J. BURPEE
ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT
DAN E. CLARK
ISAAC J. COX
MILO M. QUAIFE

Managing Editor

CLARENCE W. ALVORD

CONTENTS

Editor's Preface 211
Constitution 215
Officers and Committees for 1916-1917 217
Officers and Committees for 1917-1918 219
Tenth Annual Meeting of the Association
Beverley W. Bond, Jr. 221
Minutes of Business Transacted 239
Report of the Secretary-Treasurer, April, 1917 . . . 244
The Value of the Memoir of George Rogers Clark as an Historical Document . . . . James A. James 249
The Coming of the Circuit Rider across the Mountains
W. W. Sweet 271
Fur Trading Companies in the Northwest, 1760-1816
Wayne E. Stevens 283
Latin-American History as a Field of Study for Mississippi Valley Students . . . . . Paul F. Peck 292
Pageantry Possibilities . . . . . Bernard Sobel 301
Possibilities in State Historical Celebrations
Harlow Lindley 307
Spanish Influence in the West during the American Revolution (By Title) . . . . James A. James 318
The Pennsylvania Bribery Bill of 1836 (By Title)
Reginald C. McGrane 318
Sectionalism in Kentucky from 1855 to 1865 (By Title)
James R. Robertson 318
Glimpses of Some Old Mississippi River Posts (By Title)
Louis Pelzer 318
The Military-Indian Frontier, 1830-1835 (By Title)
Ruth A. Gallaher 318
The Rise of Sports, 1876-1893 (By Title) . Frederic L. Paxson 318
The Collapse of the Confederacy: An Analysis of Certain Internal Causes (By Title) . Lawrence H. Gipson 319
The Pioneer Aristocracy (By Title) . . . Logan Esarey 319
Some Possibilities of Historical Field Work (By Title)
Franklin F. Holbrook 319

Nauvoo: A Possible Study in Economic Determinism (By Title) . . . . . Theodore C. Pease 319
The Influence of the West on the Rise and Fall of Political Parties (By Title) . . . Homer C. Hockett 319
A Plan for the Union of British North America and the United States, 1866 (By Title) . . Theodore C. Blegen 319
President Lincoln and the Illinois Radical Republicans (By Title) . . . . . Arthur C. Cole 320
The Formation of the American Colonization Society (By Title) . . . . . Henry N. Sherwood 320
Progress within the Subject Applied to High School History (By Title) . . . . . R. M. Tryon 320
A Course in Sociological Civics (By Title) William H. Hathaway 320

CONSTITUTION[1]

I — NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Mississippi valley historical association.

II — OBJECT

The object of the association shall be to promote historical study and research and to secure coöperation between the historical societies and the departments of history of the Mississippi valley.

III — MEMBERSHIP

Membership in this association shall be divided into three classes, namely: active, sustaining, and life members. Any one interested in the study of Mississippi valley history may become a member in any of these classes upon payment of the dues hereinafter provided.

IV — OFFICERS

The officers of the association shall be a president, and a secretary-treasurer, who with nine other active members, and such ex-presidents of the association as retain their membership therein, shall constitute the executive committee. Providing that all ex-presidents who have served on the executive committee for six consecutive years shall from and after that time no longer be ex-officio members of the executive committee.

The president, secretary-treasurer, and three members of the executive committee shall be elected at the annual meeting each year. The president and secretary-treasurer shall hold office for one year, the members of the executive committee for three years or until their successors are elected and have qualified.

The executive committee shall have general charge of the affairs of the association, including the calling of meetings and selection of papers to be read. Five members of the executive

[1] As amended at the ninth annual meeting, April, 1916.

committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

At the first meeting of the executive committee after the annual election, one of its members shall be selected as chairman of the executive committee. It shall be his duty to preside at meetings of the committee and, in the absence of the president, at meetings of the association, and he shall succeed to the office of president in case of a vacancy.

V — MEETINGS

A regular annual meeting and a mid-year meeting of the association shall be held on such dates and at such places as the executive committee may determine.

VI — DUES

The annual dues for individual active members shall be three dollars. The annual dues for library members shall be four dollars. Sustaining members — either individuals or institutions — shall pay five dollars annually. Any individual may become a life member upon the payment of fifty dollars.

VII — AMENDMENTS

This constitution may be amended at any regular meeting, notice of such amendment having been given at a previous meeting, or the proposed amendment having received the approval of the executive committee.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES FOR THE YEAR 1916-1917

FREDERIC L. PAXSON, *President*
CLARENCE S. PAINE, *Secretary-Treasurer*
Deceased June 14, 1916
MRS. CLARA PAINE, *Acting Secretary-Treasurer*
Lincoln, Nebraska

Executive Committee

In addition to the officers named above

Ex-Presidents

ISAAC J. COX, *Chairman*

BENJAMIN F. SHAMBAUGH
ANDREW C. MCLAUGHLIN
JAMES A. JAMES
DUNBAR ROWLAND

Elected

MILO M. QUAIFE
WILLIAM E. CONNELLEY
ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT
MELVIN J. WHITE
JAMES F. WILLARD
EDGAR R. HARLAN
EUGENE M. VIOLETTE
CLARENCE W. ALVORD

ARCHER B. HULBERT

Executive Committee of the Teachers' Section

A. O. THOMAS, *Chairman*
HOWARD C. HILL, *Secretary*

DANA C. MUNRO
OLIVER M. DICKERSON
STELLA HERRON
JONAS VILES

MAX SOUBY

Appointive Committees

Membership Committee — Mrs. Clara Paine, Lincoln, Nebraska, chairman; A. L. Conger, W. F. Mitchell, A. L. Cross, A. C. Cole, J. M. Winterbotham.

Committee on Standardizing Library Work and Library Equipment for History in Secondary Schools — Oliver M. Dickerson, Winona, Minnesota, chairman; L. M. Larson, St. G. L. Sioussat, J. C. Hill, W. H. Shephard, Victoria Adams, Florence Hopkins.

La Salle Memorial Committee — William O. Hart, New Orleans, chairman; W. F. McCaleb, Archibald Henderson, L. H. Brewer, Dr. O. L. Schmidt, James Hazen Hyde.

Committee on the Marking of Historical Sites — William E. Connelley, Topeka, Kansas, chairman; Logan Esarey, O. A. Rothert, E. C. Barker.

Committee on the Management of State Historical Museums — Charles E. Brown, Madison, Wisconsin, chairman; G. B. Grinnell, William Beer, E. C. Page, Louis Pelzer, J. C. Smiley, M. R. Gilmore.

Committee on the Administration of State Historical Societies — John T. Lee, Madison, Wisconsin, chairman; Dan E. Clark, Elizabeth Crowther, Harlow Lindley, F. E. Melvin.

Committee on State History as a Part of the High School Curriculum — Carl E. Pray, Ypsilanti, Michigan, chairman; F. H. Hodder, D. C. Shilling, R. G. Wellington.

Nominating Committee for the Tenth Annual Meeting — Harlow Lindley, Indiana State Library, Indianapolis, chairman; E. M. Violette, Dr. O. L. Schmidt.

Program Committee for the Tenth Annual Meeting — Royal B. Way, Beloit, Wisconsin, chairman; B. W. Bond, Jr., I. J. Cox, W. E. Dodd, A. O. Thomas.

Committee on Local Arrangements for the Tenth Annual Meeting — Dr. Otto L. Schmidt, Chicago, chairman; A. H. Shearer, Caroline M. McIlvaine, Victoria S. Adams, E. E. Ayer, C. G. Dawes, C. L. Hutchinson, Seymour Morris, E. L. Ryerson, Cornelia B. Williams, C. A. Burley, C. F. Gunther, C. H. McCormick, Joy Morton, J. A. Spoor, C. H. Wacker.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES FOR THE YEAR 1917-1918

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT, *President*
MRS. CLARENCE S. PAINE, *Secretary-Treasurer*
Lincoln, Nebraska

Executive Committee

In addition to the officers named above

Ex-Presidents

ISAAC J. COX (1921), *Chairman*

ANDREW C. MCLAUGHLIN (1918)
JAMES A. JAMES (1920)
DUNBAR ROWLAND (1922)
FREDERIC L. PAXSON (1923)

Elected

MELVIN J. WHITE (1918)
JAMES F. WILLARD (1918)
EDGAR R. HARLAN (1918)
ARCHER B. HULBERT (1919)
EUGENE M. VIOLETTE (1919)
CLARENCE W. ALVORD (1919)
ORIN G. LIBBY (1920)
ALBERT H. SANFORD (1920)
HOMER C. HOCKETT (1920)

Executive Committee of the Teachers' Section

R. M. TRYON (1920), *Chairman*
HOWARD C. HILL (1918), *Secretary*
University of Chicago High School

JONAS VILES (1918)
AUGUSTUS O. THOMAS (1919)
MAX SOUBY (1919)
OSCAR H. WILLIAMS (1920)

Appointive Committees

The standing committees for 1916-1917 were retained for 1917-1918 without change in membership.

Nominating Committee for the Eleventh Annual Meeting — Benjamin F. Shambaugh, State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City, chairman; A. C. Cole, Theodore Jack.

Program Committee for the Eleventh Annual Meeting — Chauncey S. Boucher, Washington University, St. Louis, chairman; J. D. Hicks, R. M. Tryon, W. J. Trimble, W. L. Fleming.

THE TENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The tenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association was held in Chicago, April 26-28, 1917. The headquarters of the association were in the rooms of the Chicago historical society, where most of the sessions were held. With its exceedingly valuable and interesting collections, the society's building formed an ideal setting for what proved to be a most delightful and profitable meeting. One session was held in the Newberry library, and here, too, the members of the association found a most congenial atmosphere. Of special interest was an exhibit of rare maps and books that had been arranged by the library officials. For the excellent accommodations provided, and for the many courteous attentions shown, the association is greatly indebted to Dr. Otto L. Schmidt, the chairman, to Mr. Augustus H. Shearer, the vice-chairman, and to the other members of the committee on local arrangements. The general appreciation of these arrangements, and of the excellent program offered, was shown by the large attendance of the members of the association and of visitors.

The program measured up to the usual high standards of the Mississippi valley historical association. The papers were presented in an interesting fashion and were upon topics of importance. Most of them represented research in the history of the middle west, but there were several which dealt with other fields of historical interest. Also, a number of papers and discussions of a practical nature illustrated the wide range of interests covered by the Mississippi valley historical association. One commendable feature of the program was the endeavor to group the papers, as far as possible, so that each session should be devoted to the consideration of a single historical field, or to one topic. By this arrangement the effectiveness of the different sessions was much increased. Another most excellent feature of the meeting was the fact that, with the exception of the

teachers' section on Saturday morning, all the papers listed on the program were presented, and it was not necessary, as has so often been the case heretofore, to read a part of them by title only. It is to be hoped that this precedent will be followed in the future, for a meeting at which only a part of the program is carried out can never be entirely successful. Mr. Frederic L. Paxson, president of the association, presided on Thursday, but was called to Washington on important business connected with the war, so Mr. Isaac J. Cox, chairman of the executive board, filled his place at the remaining sessions.

The wide range and the importance of the papers and discussions can best be shown by a brief analysis of each. For the opening session, Thursday afternoon, there was an interesting series of papers on the history of the middle west. The first one, by Mr. James A. James of Northwestern university, was a critical estimate of "The value of the memoir of George Rogers Clark as an historical document." This memoir, which is in the possession of the Wisconsin historical society, gives a detailed account of the author's activities in Virginia, Kentucky, and the northwest, from the close of the year, 1773, to September, 1779. Its trustworthiness was first challenged by Theodore Roosevelt, upon the ground that, inasmuch as the memoir had been written thirty or forty years after the events with which it deals, it should not be given much weight. Mr. James, however, maintained that the greater part of the memoir was written in 1789 and 1790. This conclusion he supported by references to the memoir in Clark's correspondence with John Brown, delegate to congress from Kentucky. The value of the contents he showed by a comparison with Clark's letter to George Mason, with his journal, with his diary, and with Bowman's journal, all of which are generally accepted as authentic. Mr. James concluded that "the memoir can no longer be thought of as the reminiscences of an old man who strove for the dramatic in his presentation of facts." Rather it must be accepted as a trustworthy supplement to each of the main sources for the period on certain points, and to all of them in a number of essential particulars. Mr. James's paper was an interesting and instructive example of the critical and scholarly analysis that must underly any estimate of the actual value of historical sources.

Next, Mr. William W. Sweet of De Pauw university gave an interesting paper on early religious history in the middle west, under the title, "The coming of the circuit rider across the mountains." Mr. Sweet emphasized the adaptability of the Methodist system—lay preachers and the circuit plan of organization—as well as of the church doctrines, to meet the needs of the frontier. As a consequence of these factors, the growth of the Methodist denomination in the region across the mountains was rapid. Kentucky, Tennessee, and western Pennsylvania were first covered with a network of circuits and districts, and with the onward movement of population, missionaries were sent into Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and even Missouri. In 1800 the western conference was organized, including all the settlements in the territory west of the Alleghanies. Bishop Asbury crossed the mountains eighteen times, in order to hold conferences and to encourage the people. The influence of the circuit riders on the west was not merely a religious and moral one, for the orderly Methodist system of church government must have exercised a far-reaching influence in a more or less disorderly community. Mr. Sweet held that the circuit rider, contrary to the general impression, stood for moderation in religious practices, and seldom, if ever, encouraged emotional excesses. Also, Methodism was peculiarly effective in this region, inasmuch as it was able to follow immediately a moving population.

The next paper was an interesting account of "The military-Indian frontier, 1830-1835," by Miss Ruth Gallaher, a graduate student in Iowa university. During the period under consideration, the western frontier might have been represented by a triangle with its apex at Fort Leavenworth, the end of one side at Detroit, and of the other at New Orleans. Along this 1,500 miles of frontier, the United States maintained an army usually of less than 2,500 men, who garrisoned a score of posts, including especially Fort Howard, Fort Snelling, Jefferson Barracks, Fort Armstrong, Fort Crawford, Fort Gibson, and Fort Leavenworth. Life at these frontier posts was strenuous and monotonous. The soldiers protected the white settlers from the Indians, constructed buildings, and undertook expeditions against distant tribes. No provision was made for either their recreation or education. Their food consisted chiefly of meat, and flour

or meal, and up to December, 1830, there was a whiskey ration. Privates were paid five dollars a month, and non-commissioned officers ten dollars. Aside from intemperance, the greatest menace to the soldiers was the prevalence of such diseases as cholera, yellow fever, and scurvy. Most of the losses in the ranks, however, were due to desertions, which were estimated at one-fifth of this frontier army.

In the last paper of this session, "Glimpses of some old Mississippi river posts," Mr. Louis Pelzer of Iowa university added an interesting chapter to the valuable contributions he has already made to early military history in the upper Mississippi valley. He gave a picture of life at Fort Des Moines and at Jefferson Barracks, as it was experienced by the First regiment of United States dragoons. At the latter post recruits from nearly every state were trained for service on the western plains. Suffering from the lack of adequate clothing and shelter, squads of these embryo soldiers were put to work building stables and roads. Cartridge boxes, holsters, and arms were lacking, desertions were of almost nightly occurrence, and deserters were severely punished. But the raw recruits were finally rounded into a well-trained regiment under the command of Colonel Henry Dodge, and expeditions were sent from Jefferson Barracks into differents parts of the Mississippi valley.

Fort Des Moines was established as a temporary post at the mouth of the Des Moines river between 1834 and 1837, and from this headquarters an expedition was despatched through Iowa and far to the northwest, into Minnesota. Mr. Pelzer described in an interesting fashion the hardships, the illnesses, and the monotonous duties of the soldiers that were stationed at Fort Des Moines. The few ladies at the post provided a small amount of pleasant social life, and occasionally brightly dressed young soldiers went across the river to Commerce, in Illinois, to the hospitable stone house of James White. Here, with partners on the smooth floor, and "amid the strains of tortured catgut," they forgot the irksome duties of barrack life at Fort Des Moines. Finally in the spring of 1837 about fifteen dragoons, the remnants of the garrison, bade a last and perhaps a hearty farewell to what, in Mr. Pelzer's opinion, had proved to be a rather "inglorious" western post. These nar-

ratives of life in frontier posts closed an exceedingly interesting session.

At the evening session on Thursday, Mr. Clarence A. Burley, president of the Chicago historical society, was in the chair and welcomed the members and visitors in attendance upon the association. The principal feature of the evening was the presidential address of Mr. Frederic L. Paxson upon "The rise of sports, 1876-1893." This unique and most entertaining address was typical of the fashion in which the present school of American historians, of which Mr. Paxson is so leading an exponent, seeks to explain the effect upon our national attitude of changes in our every-day life and thus to account for present-day developments. Mr. Paxson pointed out the necessity, after the disappearance of the American frontier, of some new outlet through which to work off superfluous energy. This need was met by a rising interest in sports. Showing the rapid development and the gradual organization of sports, he traced the popular enthusiasm for horse racing, for yachting, and for boxing. After calling attention to the enthusiasm which greeted the late champion, John L. Sullivan, he noted the organization of baseball as a national sport. With the growth of cities and the need for exercise came the many athletic clubs, and the numerous amateur unions. The craze for croquet and for roller skating, together with the evolution and widespread use of the bicycle, bringing so many people into the open, was noted, as also the vogue of lawn tennis. The recent growth of the country club movement, and of golf, added to the popularity of the automobile, has served still further to increase the zest of the American people for outdoor life.

The period in which this expansion of sport was most notable, in Mr. Paxson's opinion, was between 1876 and 1893. During this time all our games expanded upon a widening scale, and by organization their government became "quasi-national." Added to the disappearance of the frontier, the needs of city life, also, helped in this movement, but whatever the causes, the effects upon our national life and attitude have been of the utmost importance. The "hysteria" of the past has been replaced by a "better deliberation and balance." Moral indifference to means has given way to a real concern for honest

methods. Public opinion is forcing those who would not reform of their own volition "into a reluctant compliance with the rules." Personal behavior, too, has greatly improved, and the influence of our changed attitude is evident in the prospects for a dry America with equal rights for all. Mr. Paxson intimated that the interest of women in lawn tennis and in cycling has probably been one of the great forces in bringing about suffrage reform. Moreover, the results of honest sport have perhaps served to "steady and inspire a new Americanism for a new century." The entire address was of much intrinsic interest and indicated a thorough and inclusive research into an extensive field, in addition to a philosophical analysis of the details presented.

For the morning session on Friday at the Newberry library, there was an interesting series of papers which dealt with phases of middle-western and southern history, and with practical historical work. The first, by Mr. Wayne E. Stevens of the university of Minnesota, was on the topic, "Fur-trading companies in the northwest, 1760-1816." Up to 1800, Mr. Stevens pointed out, British traders, operating from Montreal as a base, were in almost exclusive control of the fur trade in the great lakes region and in the upper Mississippi valley. During the revolution and the years immediately following, they built up the business organization which was the foundation of the great trading companies that eventually controlled the commerce of the northwest. The earliest of these associations was the North-west company, formed by a number of Montreal merchants in 1783 and 1784. This company gradually absorbed all its rivals, with the exception of the Hudson's bay company, until it monopolized the trade of the region to the northwest of lake Superior. The commerce of the country to the south of the great lakes was exploited by individual merchants and small trading concerns up to 1806, when a group of Canadian merchants formed the Michillimackinac company. The success of this new enterprise was short-lived, however, owing to the rivalry of the United States government factories, together with John Jacob Astor's American fur company, and to the political difficulties between the United States and Great Britain. In 1810 the Michillimackinac company was succeeded

by the Montreal-Michillimackinac company, and in 1811 this new association was merged with the American fur company in the South-west company. When congress in 1816 excluded British traders from American territory, Astor bought out the interest of the Montreal-Michillimackinac company in the South-west company and thus secured control over a large share of the fur trade in the great lakes region and in the upper Mississippi valley. This step completed the transition from British to American ascendancy.

In the next paper, "The collapse of the confederacy," Mr. Lawrence H. Gipson of Wabash college analyzed the psychological factors which were, he considered, responsible for the defeat of the south in the civil war. In his opinion, the confederacy was sadly lacking in the four psychological factors necessary for the success of such a struggle. First, for the necessary leadership to inspire confidence Jefferson Davis did not possess the essential qualifications. He was inconsistent and lacked both vision and the ability to think clearly upon the many problems that arose. Although he was firmly devoted to the interests of the south, he failed to be a truly great leader owing to his blind sectionalism. Secondly, Mr. Gipson considered that the southern leaders, in standing for property rights as against human rights, turned their backs upon many of the great idealists who had been the leaders of their section. Thus, the south was unable to fight with a deep-seated belief in the righteousness of her cause. Thirdly, the south had no clear and well-defined goal for which she struggled and, therefore, failed to exert her maximum efficiency. Fourthly, and of greatest importance in Mr. Gipson's opinion, was the failure of the southern people to merge their personal preference in the common interests. This situation, he believed, was due chiefly to the individualistic organization of southern society. As proof of this assertion Mr. Gipson noted the continual quarrels in the confederate cabinet, the attacks by the press upon the president, and the quarrels between the central government and the states over such questions as conscription and martial law. But for these psychological defects, Mr. Gipson considered that it might have been possible for the south to have maintained herself as a separate nation.

The next paper, "The pioneer aristocracy," by Mr. Logan Esarey of Indiana university, was an exceedingly interesting account of the origin and customs of the early settlers in the Ohio valley. These pioneers were the descendants of emigrants who came originally from almost all the countries of Europe, and especially from southern Germany, France, Ireland, Scotland, and England. In the closing years of the eighteenth century they occupied the eastern and southern foothills of the Appalachians. In Pennsylvania they scattered along the mountain valleys and were known as the Pennsylvania Dutch. Another considerable portion of them lived in the Shenandoah valley, while a third center was in the upland region of the Carolinas and Georgia. From all these points they converged on the Ohio valley in their western migration. By the middle of the nineteenth century they had become firmly established in Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, where they formed the prevailing type. The methods of these pioneers in subduing the wilderness were set forth by Mr. Esarey, as well as their social pastimes, their religious and political beliefs, and their visions of the future.

This session concluded with a paper by Mr. Franklin F. Holbrook of the Minnesota historical society on "Some possibilities of historical field work." Mr. Holbrook gave a résumé of the methods used and the results of aggressive work by a field agent of the Minnesota historical society who is engaged in a county-to-county campaign. At present his work is centered upon a survey of county archives which will ultimately provide data for a guide to these records, as well as information regarding their condition. Results thus far have shown that there is much valuable historical material in these archives, but that conditions with respect to their permanence and accessibility are far from satisfactory. Also, lists are being kept of the newspaper files that are to be found in each locality, and in addition to the value of this information, important accessions have been secured for the society's collections. An attempt, also, to locate historical material in private hands has been rewarded by the acquisition of considerable printed and manuscript matter. Another important aspect of the field agent's work is to call attention to, and to enlist popular interest in,

historical activity. With the apt observation that in a first visit it is often possible only to commence a work that will be completed later as favorable opportunity arises, Mr. Holbrook concluded a paper that in practical suggestions for aggressive historical work was of the utmost value.

The afternoon session of Friday, like the one in the morning, offered a program that was partly practical, and partly representative of historical research. Preëminently of the former type was the first paper, by Mr. Paul F. Peck of Grinnell college, on "Latin-American history as a field of study for Mississippi valley students." In justification of his plea for undergraduate courses in Latin-American history, Mr. Peck showed the importance of Spanish influence upon the Mississippi valley during the period of exploration, during Spain's ownership of Louisiana, and during the diplomatic negotiations that culminated in the treaty of 1819. Still another reason for interest in Latin-American history is the close similarity in the topography and in the development of the economic and social problems of the valley of the Mississippi and of that of the Paraná. Lastly, the increasing interest in the west coast of South America, since the opening of the Panama canal, makes it incumbent upon the colleges and universities to afford their students an opportunity to study the history and the present conditions of this region. Latin-American history is preëminently suited for lecture work, but there is an abundance of material printed in English that is available for the use of the students who are taking courses covering this field. After an experience of six years, Mr. Peck has found that students take a keen interest in such a course. He has secured especially good results in the preparation by students of permanent charts of the varied economic and social problems of Latin-America. There should also be a "stiff dose" of Spanish and Portuguese history in order to afford a background for institutional development. Finally, a course in Latin-American history will put the student in touch with the aims and aspirations of other republics and will afford an appreciation of Pan-Americanism. In view of all these facts, Mr. Peck urged that an elective course of at least one year should be given in all the colleges and universities of the Mississippi valley.

The next two papers considered practical aspects of historical celebrations, and were both founded upon experience gained in the observance of the centennial of Indiana. As a number of states in the Mississippi valley are about to undertake similar celebrations, these papers were especially appropriate at the present time. The first one, by Mr. Bernard Sobel of Purdue university, discussed "Pageantry possibilities." Emphasizing the adaptability of a pageant to local conditions, Mr. Sobel considered that the two requisites for a successful performance are a genuinely patriotic spirit and a scenario that possesses unity. The latter may be secured either by a chronological order in the episodes, or by historical and symbolical characters which go through the entire pageant. Unity may also be achieved by the costumes, especially if there is a definite color scheme, while the music, preferably by a band, may be used in a significant fashion. The plot of the pageant should be simple, the main outline plastic and adaptable to interpolation. Detail and intricacy in the main theme are impracticable, and a few simply drawn characters should represent some definite purpose or event allied to the main episodes. In the episodes, drills, dances, and similar features may be introduced. The management of such details as rehearsals, advertising, and finances must be carefully considered, and of special importance is the libretto, which should give a complete interpretation of the various incidents. Questions of stage directions and of rehearsals must be left to the discretion of the pageant master, but it is exceedingly desirable that entrances and exits should follow one another in rapid succession, and that they should be rehearsed separately and repeatedly, in order to ensure smoothness and easy transitions. Mr. Sobel's entire paper was written from the standpoint of practicality, and it should prove a useful guide to anyone who attempts to stage an historical pageant.

The next paper, "Possibilities in state historical celebrations," was read by Mr. Harlow Lindley, secretary of the Indiana historical commission. This paper, also, was rich in useful suggestions drawn from practical experience. The Indiana historical commission was organized with $25,000 at its disposal, of which $5,000 was available for publications, and

the remainder for the celebration of the state centennial. The year's work of the commission had two important results; first, throughout Indiana a new interest has been aroused in state and local history; secondly, a marked community spirit and consciousness has been created. Still another important achievement is the impetus that has been given to the movement for a system of state parks. But much work was necessary in order to secure these results. The first problem was to arouse throughout the state an appreciation of the value of centennial observances. This was done by bulletins and newspaper articles, through the medium of county institutes, and by addresses before different organizations. Still another means of stimulating interest was the setting aside of February 22 as an Indiana products day, upon which banquets should be held with a menu of "home-grown dishes." Also, with the help of George Ade a unique invitation to home-coming week was gotten up, while lantern slides, in addition to the moving picture, "Indiana," were used in order to arouse popular enthusiasm for the centennial celebration.

The keynote of the commission's plans was to provide a decentralized celebration that would be state-wide in its scope. A centennial chairman was appointed in each county, and the general schedule provided for local and school celebrations early in the spring, to be followed by county observances in the fall. The program at these affairs usually included reunions, pageants, parades, and various patriotic exercises. Two celebrations of state-wide importance were held, one at Corydon and the other at Indianapolis. By the generally decentralized celebration, a keener appreciation of the history, resources, and possibilities of the state was developed, which should result in the future in a higher type of citizenship. The pageant was employed on a wide scale, as one of the best means to arouse interest. By a campaign of education, including a summer course at the state university, and by bulletins, an impetus was given to the movement for the use of pageantry in historical anniversaries. One notable result was the development of home talent, for of the forty-five pageants given, all but about a half-dozen were written in Indiana. It is estimated that as many as 250,000 citizens witnessed at least one pageant, and that

from 30,000 to 40,000 participated in such affairs. In conclusion, Mr. Lindley gave a number of hints as to the pitfalls which practical experience has shown await the promoters of a pageant. Also, he noted the chief requisites of a successful historical celebration. His paper was an effective illustration of what can be accomplished in state celebrations and was one that will be of great value to persons in other states who contemplate similar undertakings.

For the concluding paper of this afternoon session, Mr. Theodore C. Pease of the university of Illinois discussed the very interesting subject, "Nauvoo: a possible study in economic determinism." As the Mormon metropolis, Nauvoo attracted a population, of which the overwhelming proportion were laborers, that was much larger than its industrial development warranted. A number of manufactures were established, and there were several trade associations of laborers. But as there was never sufficient manufacturing to give employment to the population of 15,000 or more, the Mormon leaders were obliged to discourage intending settlers, although Joseph Smith used every possible pressure to induce Mormons possessing abundant capital to locate there. The necessity to provide work, Mr. Pease considered, probably accounted for the elaborate public buildings that were erected. Though the workmen employed on these improvements gave part of their time without charge, they were aided by tithes from their brethren who lived outside the town. This situation may account for the busy industry, the numerous public buildings, and the brick houses, as well as for the discontent of the laborers in Nauvoo. Mr. Pease concluded that whether the town, if left in peace, "could have reached a sound economic condition, or whether by economic laws it was doomed from its beginning, are questions interesting but unanswerable."

At the conclusion of this afternoon session the association adjourned to the Selig polyscope theater, 58 East Washington street. Here, through the courtesy of Mr. Robert C. Lieber of Indianapolis, the members enjoyed a view of the picture drama, "Indiana." In this fashion it was possible to secure an insight into at least a part of the practical work undertaken by the Indiana historical commission. Indeed, this little interlude

in the more serious activities of the day proved to be one of the most enjoyable, as well as profitable, events of the meeting.

For the evening session on Friday, the majority of the papers dealt with middle-western history. The first one, entitled "The influence of the west on the rise and fall of political parties," was read by Mr. Homer C. Hockett of Ohio state university. The paper considered chiefly the shifting of the center of economic and political power as a result of the change, between 1790 and 1830, in the relative weight of the population west and east of the Alleghanies from one in fifteen to six in fifteen. This growth in the west was responsible for the overthrow in 1800 of the federalist party, of which the stronghold was on the coast. Although the government's foreign policy from 1807 to 1815 drove many republican converts back to the federalist ranks, the recurrence of interest in western development after the war of 1812 brought about the end of the latter party. For another decade the chief element in the settlement of the west was the stock that had already won the Ohio valley for republicanism. But the economic development of the west and the south soon diverged. Under the leadership of Henry Clay the west formulated its economic creed in the so-called American system. The planter, however, refused to accept this theory, and by 1825 the two geographical sections which had been strongholds of republicanism held widely different views on national policy and constitutional interpretation. Thus, the decade, 1815-1825, saw the disintegration of both the old parties. Their elements, with those contributed by the new west, were poured into the melting pot, to emerge in new combinations.

The next paper, by Mr. Theodore C. Blegen of the Riverside high school, Milwaukee, discussed "A plan for the union of British North America and the United States, 1866." Mr. Blegen asserted that, according to Canadian public opinion, the chief motives for the abrogation of the Elgin-Marcy treaty were resentment over the attitude of Canada during the civil war, and the hope of compelling a political union of the Dominion with the United States. In 1866, a bill was introduced in the house of representatives which was in reality a standing offer that whenever any province wished to be annexed, it should be

admitted to the United States, subject to the approval of Great Britain. Taylor, the author of the bill, was an agent of the treasury department and was considered an authority on the Canadian northwest. The bill aroused much discussion, and Canadian newspapers regarded it as another proof of the motives they had ascribed in the abrogation of the Elgin-Marcy treaty. The real purpose of the bill was to further interest in the Northern Pacific railroad, and to help bring about the annexation of the Canadian northwest. Taylor believed that a popular vote in that region would favor such a move. In a similar belief the legislature of Minnesota urged the American government to take steps toward the annexation of western British America, while the United States senate adopted a resolution that was similar to Taylor's plan, but applied only to the northwest. The sentiment in favor of such a move was reflected in the attitude of Sumner and of President Grant, and in statements by Secretary Fish and by the British minister, Thornton. That the question of annexation or of independence should be submitted to the voters of the provinces affected, was frequently suggested. This agitation was effectually quieted by the Canadian attitude, by the treaty of Washington, by the settlement of the Riel disturbances, and by other events.

The next paper, entitled "President Lincoln and the Illinois radical republicans," was read by Mr. Arthur C. Cole of the university of Illinois. Mr. Cole showed that Lincoln entered upon his presidential career without a clear record as a radical opponent of the institution of slavery. With the outbreak of the war, the regular republican following in Illinois was rapidly converted to the abolition ground that this was a divinely appointed opportunity for a death struggle between freedom and slavery. But Lincoln soon announced various policies that greatly disappointed these radicals. They were especially worried by the lack of sufficient aggressiveness in the prosecution of the war upon the south and its institutions. Lincoln soon became the object of much party criticism and pressure which, although it does not seem seriously to have embarrassed his policies, doubtless hastened his decision to issue the emancipation proclamation. This belated action did not satisfy the radicals, and they criticized the general adminis-

tration of the war, the foreign policy of the government, and Lincoln's views on reconstruction. Also, they opposed his renomination, and later his election. But after the military victories of September, 1864, they generally went with the tide. After Lincoln's reëlection, they still pressed their reconstruction policy, until his martyrdom shifted the controversy to Andrew Johnson.

The last paper of the evening was entitled "The formation of the American colonization society," and was read by Mr. Henry N. Sherwood of the state normal school, La Crosse, Wisconsin. Mr. Sherwood traced the organization of a national society in December, 1816, by several groups of men. Each of these groups had already advocated the deportation of the free negro beyond the limits of the white settlements of America and had, heretofore, acted independently of the others. The paper set forth the leadership and personnel of each group, as well as its specific recommendations. From this evidence Mr. Sherwood drew the conclusion that double dealing and insincere motives had little, if any, place in this meeting. The dominant purposes of the new organization were to deport all free negroes to Africa, to christianize that continent, to stop the slave trade, and to establish commerce in legitimate articles of trade between Africa and America. It was their intention to enlist the national government in the project. Among the most active men in bringing about the formation of the "American society for colonizing the Free People of Color of the United States" (the society was first known by this name) were Samuel J. Mills, Robert Finley, Charles Fenton Mercer, and Elias B. Caldwell. Mr. Sherwood's conclusions would seem to afford a starting point for the historian who would "disentangle the complicated web" of charges and countercharges made in connection with this society in later times.

On Saturday morning there was a joint meeting of the history teachers' section with the Cook county history teachers' association. In the absence of the chairman of this section, Mr. Augustus O. Thomas of Lincoln, Nebraska, Mr. Albert H. Sanford of the state normal school, La Crosse, Wisconsin, presided. Mr. R. M. Tryon of the university of Chicago discussed "Progress within the subject applied to high school history." Pointing

out the acknowledged need for a readjustment of the history course as it is given at present, Mr. Tryon's paper was an able plea for a recognition of the increasing maturity of the student. In spite of the fact that such progress cannot be obtained as easily in history as in Latin and mathematics, he considered that the problem is one that is capable of solution. After a careful and comprehensive analysis of the seemingly insurmountable difficulties to be overcome, Mr. Tryon showed by reference to the successive cycles of American history, as it is commonly taught in the grades, in the high school, and in the college, that too frequently there is little recognition of the principle of progress. This defect he would remedy, "first, by the teacher's method of procedure in teaching the subject; secondly, by a close organization of topics presented in two or more cycles, so that a higher level of ability will be demanded at each level; and, thirdly, by an organization and selection of the topics in each cycle so that there will be little or no repetition." Mr. Tryon also emphasized the necessity for work outside of the text, which should be used in the daily recitation. His paper was given point by a practical outline of the methods he proposed for the first, second, and third years of the high school, in order to apply the principle of progress within the subject. Altogether, he gave a most interesting and searching analysis of one of the most vital problems that confronts the history teacher. The paper elicited a spirited discussion.

The next paper, by Mr. W. H. Hathaway of Milwaukee, described a course in socialized civics, as it is given in the Riverside high school. The course covers one year and is designed for either third or fourth year students. The first semester, civics in general is considered, with the stress laid upon local affairs. The remainder of the course takes up social problems and is grouped about the following topics: conservation, the family, the unfortunate, and labor. This paper, also, was followed by an informal discussion, led in this instance by Mr. Byron C. Legg of the Mishawaka high school. Following this discussion, Mr. Beverley W. Bond, Jr. of Purdue university explained the purpose of a report by a committee of the Indiana history teachers' section for a revised history course in the high school. In brief, the report recommended that the first

year should be devoted to an introductory course, including oriental and ancient history and European history up to 1648, that the second year should include European history from 1648 to 1914, and the third year should be confined to American history and civics. The committee also recommended that social and economic history should receive at least as much attention as political. In addition to these papers and discussions, the teachers' section was honored with an informal talk by Mr. Henry Johnson of the Teachers' college, Columbia university, who happened to be in Chicago at this time. This entire session was an extremely helpful and suggestive one, although it was greatly to be regretted that two of the principal speakers on the program failed either to be present or to send in their papers.

As usual, one of the most enjoyable features of the meeting was the group of delightful social diversions provided by the committee on local arrangements. The first of these events was a most delightful and well-attended reception given by the Chicago historical society in their commodious rooms, at the conclusion of the Thursday evening session. On Friday, at noon, the Chicago historical society again acted as hosts, this time at luncheon at the Congress hotel. Immediately following this luncheon came the annual business meeting. The social affairs of the meeting were concluded on Saturday with an automobile drive through the park boulevard system of Chicago, which was still another instance of the thoughtfulness and courtesy of the local committee.

In every respect the tenth annual meeting was one of the most successful that the Mississippi valley historical association has ever had. The wide range of the papers, the many contributions to Mississippi valley history, as well as the attention given to various aspects of historical activity, testified to the effective work which is being carried on by the association. The fact, too, that so many of the members found time to come, many of them from a considerable distance, was an excellent proof of the real interest that is being aroused. In all, seventy-eight members registered, in comparison with fifty-eight at the Nashville meeting the previous year, while a large number were present who failed to register. This marked increase in the attendance at Chicago demonstrates the wisdom of holding the annual

meeting every other year at some convenient and centrally located point, with a session in alternate years at such distant cities as Nashville. By this policy a large attendance will be ensured biennially, while at the same time the necessity of extending the influence of the association will not be disregarded. It is to be hoped that this arangement will become an established custom.

Especially gratifying was the report of the secretary-treasurer, Mrs. Clarence S. Paine, which showed that the association's affairs are in excellent shape. The total income has not suffered, while the net assets show a gain of more than $500.00 over 1916. Moreover, the abolition of the one dollar memberships has not resulted in the loss that was feared. In 1916 there were 481 subscribing members, as compared with 667 on April 30, 1917, or there was a gain of 186. This increase offset the loss of the one dollar members and is a tribute to the efficient work of the secretary-treasurer, especially in view of the untoward financial situation during the past year. If only this record can be kept up, the association should weather with perfect ease the present crisis in our national life. The *Review* should be on the shelves of every public and college library, for the material it contains is indispensable to a thorough study of the history of the Mississippi valley. In securing this result, and in extending the influence of the association, each member should bear a personal part.

Beverley W. Bond, Jr.

Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

MINUTES OF BUSINESS TRANSACTED AT THE TENTH ANNUAL MEETING

The tenth annual meeting of the Mississippi valley historical association was called to order at 2:30 P. M., Thursday, April 26, 1917, by the president, Frederic L. Paxson. The following committees were appointed: Committee on resolutions regarding the death of the former secretary-treasurer, Clarence S. Paine — Isaac J. Cox, chairman, and all the past presidents of the association present; Auditing committee — William E. Connelley, Solon J. Buck, Milo M. Quaife; Committee on resolutions — Logan Esarey, Aleida J. Pieters, Louis Pelzer.

President Paxson presented the following resolution:

The Mississippi valley historical association in session in Chicago, Illinois, at its tenth annual meeting, April 26, 1917, urges that means be taken by the government of the United States to facilitate the sound historical instruction of the people of the United States to the end that a correct public opinion with full knowledge of the facts that have made for our democracy and freedom in the past may stand stubbornly in our struggle for the maintenance of those principles in the future.

It was voted that the resolution be referred to the executive committee with power to act for the association in the premises. This resolution was approved by the executive committee.

The annual business meeting of the association was held immediately following the luncheon at the Congress hotel, April 27. In the absence of the president, the chairman of the executive committee, Isaac J. Cox, presided.

The following resolution prepared by the special committee was read by the chairman, C. W. Alvord:

Since the last annual meeting the association has lost by death its founder and best known member, Clarence S. Paine. In the fall of 1907 it was at the call of Mr. Paine that representatives of various western historical agencies met at Lincoln, Nebraska, and started the movement which led to the formation of the Mississippi valley historical association. From that date until his death Mr. Paine was secretary-treasurer of the

association and carried the burden of work upon his shoulders. He was more than an efficient official. His optimism and enthusiasm for the cause he had so much at heart inspired others and encouraged them to join their efforts with his. From the first Mr. Paine took his stand firmly for the highest ideals of scientific work and it was his influence more than that of any other which has given the association the good reputation it enjoys today. Mr. Paine was a man of financial genius and for years he was the pilot who steered the association safely away from the banks of bankruptcy, which frequently threatened it. During our long association with him, we, the members of the Mississippi valley association, learned to admire his ability and to love his personality; and at this first meeting since his death we take occasion to express to his wife, his family, and his state, the deep sense of obligation which we owe to him, and to give voice to our sympathy in their loss which in a very particular manner we share.

The resolution was adopted by a rising vote.

An informal report was presented by the editor of the *Mississippi valley historical review*. The report was accepted.

The report of the auditing committee was presented by the chairman, William E. Connelley, as follows:

Your committee appointed to audit the books and accounts of the association for the year ending with this annual meeting beg to submit the following report:

That the accounts for the year be approved together with the administration of them by the secretary-treasurer.

That the secretary-treasurer and the association be congratulated on the improved condition of the finances.

That in future the practice of payment by the association for the separates of articles be discontinued. Let the authors of contributions deal directly with the publisher under terms secured by the secretary-treasurer.

That the transactions of the association have grown to such proportions that the method of reporting to this body now in use is inadequate. It is impossible for an auditing committee intelligently to check the business for the entire year in any amount of time at its disposal at an annual meeting.

That it is our judgment the books and accounts of the association should, at the expense of the association, be audited annually immediately prior to the annual meeting by a recognized and responsible accounting company, and a complete exhibit of the transactions of the year should be shown in detail.

A summary of this exhibit should constitute the report of the secretary-treasurer, and should be subscribed and sworn to as required in banks and state offices. The report of the accounting company should be submitted with that of the secretary-treasurer, so that the auditing committee may be able quickly to prepare a report at the annual meeting.

The report was accepted and the recommendations adopted.

The report of the secretary-treasurer, Mrs. Clarence S. Paine, was read and accepted.[1]

The report of the nominating committee was presented by the chairman, Harlow W. Lindley, as follows:

For president — St. George L. Sioussat.

For secretary-treasurer — Mrs. Clarence S. Paine.

For members of the executive committee for three years — Orin G. Libby, Albert H. Sanford, and Homer C. Hockett.

For members of the executive committee of the teachers' section for three years — R. M. Tryon, chairman, and Oscar H. Williams.

For members of the board of editors for three years — Dan E. Clark, Isaac J. Cox, and Milo M. Quaife.

The report was accepted and the secretary was instructed to cast the unanimous ballot of the association for the officers as nominated.

On behalf of the Minnesota historical society, the association was invited to hold its eleventh annual meeting in St. Paul at the time of the dedication of the new historical building in that city. An invitation was presented from the chamber of commerce of La Crosse, Wisconsin, to meet in that city in 1918 on a date convenient to the association. After some discussion it was voted that the question of the place of meeting be referred to the executive committee. It was voted that the executive committee be directed to consider also the question of the advisability of meeting every two years or every three years in Chicago.

The following resolution was presented by Harlow Lindley:

Whereas, The dunes of Indiana, a wonderful region of unique characteristics and high historical value differentiated from all national parks in this country, have been recently recommended to congress for purchase as a national park by Secretary of the Interior Lane after

[1] See *post*, 244-248.

full investigation upon information presented by Director of National Parks Mather, and such acquisition has been endorsed by the governors of the two great states of Indiana and Illinois, and

Whereas, These dunes should be preserved as a monument and playground for the coming generation as well as for the comfort and welfare of the five million persons living very near the dunes, and

Whereas, Any delay in securing this natural park must inevitably endanger such purpose,

Be it therefore resolved, That the members of the Mississippi valley historical association here assembled appeal to congress to take such immediate and favorable action upon this report of Secretary Lane as will enable the country to secure the dunes and set the same aside forever as a national park for the people.

Mr. Shambaugh spoke on behalf of other parks along the upper Mississippi in Illinois and Wisconsin that should be preserved and urged that they be considered in connection with the dunes of Indiana. It was voted that the resolution, together with the suggestions of Mr. Shambaugh, be referred to the executive committee.

An invitation on behalf of the Ohio valley historical association to attend its meeting at Pittsburgh, November 30 and December 1, 1917, was presented by Burd S. Patterson, president of the Ohio valley historical association and secretary of the Historical society of western Pennsylvania, and was referred to the executive committee.

The business session then adjourned.

The executive committee met at the Congress hotel at 3 P. M., April 27, 1917. Those present were I. J. Cox, C. W. Alvord, A. H. Sanford, H. C. Hockett, J. A. James, and Mrs. C. S. Paine. Mr. Cox was elected chairman of the committee for the coming year.

It was voted that the secretary be directed to prepare a budget of expenses for the coming year and submit the same by mail to the members of the finance committee and later to the entire executive committee.

It was voted that the question of the place of meeting in 1918 be submitted to all the members of the executive committee by mail, also the question of the advisability of meeting every other year in Chicago.

It was voted that the resolution presented by Mr. Lindley regarding the dunes of Indiana be adopted and that the appropriate congressional committee be informed of the action.

The executive committee then adjourned.

At the session of the association on the evening of April 27, a report of the committee on resolutions was presented by the chairman, Logan Esarey, as follows:

Be it resolved, That this association by a vote of thanks express its appreciation to the Chicago historical society, not only for its hospitality in tendering the use of its building as a meeting place, and for the splendid entertainment and luncheon at the Congress hotel, and for the pleasant sight-seeing trip by automobile over the city, but more especially for the appreciation of our work shown by the members of the society;

To the directors of the Newberry library for the use of their library as a meeting place and for the courtesies of the library display for the pleasure of the association;

To Robert C. Lieber of Indianapolis and the Selig polyscope company of Chicago for the pleasure of seeing the Indiana history films.

We would also take this opportunity to express our thanks and approval to the officers of this association for their work and care in preparing the excellent program of the meeting.

The report was received and the resolutions adopted by a unanimous vote.

Clara S. Paine, *Secretary*

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

(April, 1916, to April, 1917)

The work of the association during the year just closed has been subject to varied and sudden changes. The general unsettled condition of the country, together with the rapid increase in the cost of living, has had a material effect upon our organization. It has been exceedingly difficult to secure new members; indeed every effort has been resorted to in order to retain the old members. The raise in dues decided upon at the last annual meeting seemed for the best and it has so resulted. There was a time, however, when the cancellations were so numerous it was doubtful whether the association could stand the strain. The crisis has been safely passed, and you will agree when you hear the financial report that the association has never been on a firmer basis. The raise in dues did not affect libraries or individuals who were both members of the association and subscribers to the *Review*; and when it was understood that under the new arrangement members were to receive all publications issued by the association, including the quarterly *Review*, many who had canceled renewed their memberships. Some have inquired, however, about the annual volume of Proceedings, fearing it is to be discontinued. Our difficulties may not be entirely over when it is noted that the next volume of Proceedings is published as a supplement to the *Review*.

The appearance of volume viii of the Proceedings was delayed several months owing to the difficulty experienced in getting all the papers together and for other unavoidable reasons, but it was mailed out at a time when it aided materially in collecting membership dues.

Following Mr. Paine's sudden death, the president consulted with the executive committee and the affairs of the association were placed under my care. I had always been closely associated with my husband's work in the past and his aspirations were my aspirations. Since I have endured alone the worry and trials of the year just closed, my respect and regard for my husband have increased if that were possible.

The mid-year meeting of the association convened in Cincinnati, Ohio, at the time of the annual meeting of the American historical association. About one hundred members of the Mississippi valley historical association were in attendance. A dinner was held on Tuesday evening, December 26, at the Sinton hotel, at which informal reports were made

by the president and other officers. There was a general discussion of committee work, but the committees, having been so recently appointed, could only outline their plans for the future. A discussion over the subject of the teaching of state history in the high schools aroused much interest.

The conference of teachers of history in secondary schools on Thursday morning, December 28, was presided over by James A. Sullivan, representing this association, which had been asked to take charge of this conference. Carl E. Pray of the state normal school at Ypsilanti, Michigan, and Glen Levin Swiggett of the United States bureau of education presented papers. Mr. Pray's paper was discussed by Victoria Adams of Chicago and Mr. Swiggett's by Frank P. Goodwin of Cincinnati. "The teaching of history as affected by the present war" was discussed by Albert McKinley of the university of Pennsylvania, Samuel B. Harding of the university of Indiana, and Shirley Farr of the university of Chicago.

A meeting of the executive committee and board of editors was held Thursday evening, December 28, at a dinner at the Sinton hotel. There were present Andrew C. McLaughlin, James A. James, Isaac J. Cox, St. George L. Sioussat, Archer B. Hulbert, Eugene M. Violette, Solon J. Buck, Frederic L. Paxson, and Mrs. C. S. Paine. After a general discussion of matters relating to the association, it was resolved by the executive committee:

"(1) That future payments on account of association or *Review* liabilities shall be made by the secretary-treasurer upon receipt of voucher bearing endorsement of the officer responsible for the expenditure, and that of the chairman of the executive committee, or his deputy, who shall place upon the voucher its proper serial number.

"(2) That a standing finance committee be created, including as chairman the chairman of the executive committee, and in addition to him the president, the managing editor, and the secretary-treasurer, which committee shall (a) manage the finances of the association, (b) present estimates for an annual budget to the annual meeting, and (c) transfer items within the estimates according to the best needs of the association.

"(3) That the chairman of the executive committee shall direct the finances until the next annual meeting, at which time the budget system shall begin to operate.

"(4) That Mrs. Clarence S. Paine shall be acting secretary-treasurer and business manager of the *Review* for the present in the place of A. O. Thomas, to whom the thanks of the executive committee are hereby conveyed.

"(5) That the business manager be requested to proceed with the soliciting of the guaranty fund for the *Review* for another three-year period."

On Friday afternoon, December 29, was held the formal joint session of the Mississippi valley historical association with the American historical association, Isaac J. Cox, chairman of the executive committee, presiding in the absence of the president. The program consisted of papers on "Spanish influence in the west during the American revolution," by James A. James of Northwestern university; "The Pennsylvania bribery bill of 1836," by Reginald C. McGrane of the university of Cincinnati; "Sectionalism in Kentucky from 1855 to 1865," by James R. Robertson of Berea college; and "The influence of the religious press of Cincinnati on the northern border states," by Ernest A. Smith of Salt Lake City.

The third year of the publication of the *Mississippi valley historical review* has just closed and the high character of this quarterly is unexcelled by any publication of this kind. The guarantors have stood faithfully by the project and some action should be taken at this meetign to express to them our appreciation of their support. It is a matter of regret that we cannot declare the association able to bear all the expense incident to publishing the *Review*. After the action of the executive committee authorizing a renewal of the guaranty fund Mr. Alvord and the secretary made every effort to secure it, and up to this time over one thousand dollars has been pledged. The *Review* is assured for another year and since a number of the guarantors have renewed for three years I have no hesitancy in saying that practically all the money is in sight to guaranty the expenses of the association for the next three years, counting, of course, upon the annual membership dues together with the guaranty fund, advertising, and the income from the sale of publications.

Should conditions in the life of our country return to normal many new members could be secured in the next three years. As chairman of the membership committee I have spent much thought on the subject of the best way to enlarge the association. The committee was just ready to make a widespread canvass for new members when the present war conditions enveloped the nation and it seemed best to postpone our efforts until a more opportune time. Since conditions do not affect libraries so much as individuals, a systematic canvass will be made of the large libraries not already members of the association.

The existing uncertainty in the business world has also made it exceedingly difficult to get advertising, a task that has never been an easy one during the life of the *Review*. I have used energy, nerve, and

postage before the issue of each number with but indifferent results, although on comparison with the advertising of previous years it is up to the average.

The following deaths have been reported the past year: Mrs. Jackson Beyer, of Des Moines, Iowa; Captain J. H. Burnham, of Bloomington, Illinois; Horace E. Deemer, of Red Oak, Iowa; Charles R. Green, of Olathe, Kansas; J. G. Metcalf, of Morristown, New Jersey; Clarence S. Paine, of Lincoln, Nebraska; Elbert Marshall Pike, of Cincinnati, Ohio; Dr. W. H. Stennett, of Oak Park, Illinois, and William Craig Wilcox, of Iowa City, Iowa.

The place of meeting for 1917 was determined late last year when on the order of the president a vote of the members of the executive committee was taken by mail and Chicago selected. The following local committee on arrangements was appointed: Dr. Otto L. Schmidt, chairman, Augustus H. Shearer, vice-chairman, Caroline M. McIlvaine, Victoria Adams, Edward E. Ayer, Charles G. Dawes, Charles L. Hutchinson, Seymour Morris, Edward L. Ryerson, Cornelia B. Williams, Clarence A. Burley, Charles F. Gunther, Cyrus H. McCormick, Joy Morton, John A. Spoor, and Charles H. Wacker. The program committee, appointed soon after the Nashville meeting, consists of Royal B. Way, chairman, Beverley W. Bond, Jr., Isaac J. Cox, William E. Dodd, and A. O. Thomas. The excellent program before you at this meeting is the result of the efforts of Mr. Way and his committee.

At the present time the Mississippi valley historical association has 667 members in good standing to June 1, 1917. There are on the mailing list in addition to this number 146 whose membership dues were paid last year and who are entitled to receive the 1915-16 PROCEEDINGS. They have this year also received the *Review*. They have not responded to statements sent them but there is reason to believe that many of them will remit their dues before the end of the fiscal year. A total of 138 have canceled memberships since June 1, 1916. Not all these cancellations were caused by the raise in dues; some were from those who had been delinquent a long time and were asked to express themselves. The association has no indebtedness of any kind and a balance in the bank of $237.95.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

April 30, 1916 – April 30, 1917

Receipts

Individual membership fees	$ 963.00	
Library membership fees	877.50	
Sustaining membership fees	380.00	
Guaranty for *Review*	1925.00	
Advertising	73.05	
Book sales	112.79	
Exchange	2.05	
Miscellaneous receipts	27.65	
Total receipts		$4361.04
Balance on hand, April 30, 1916		223.02

Disbursements

Publications	$2812.91	
Clerical salaries	540.00	
Editorial expenses	282.50	
Postage and express	124.57	
Miscellaneous printing	84.75	
Office supplies	10.21	
Traveling expenses	166.87	
Freight and drayage	5.30	
Borrowed money repaid	300.00	
Interest on same	5.25	
Miscellaneous	13.75	
Total disbursements		$4346.11
Balance on hand		237.95
	$4584.06	$4584.06

The foregoing is a correct statement of the transactions of the Mississippi valley historical association for the year ending April 30, 1917, as shown by the books of Clara S. Paine, secretary-treasurer.

H. S. Wiggins, *C. P. A.*

Lincoln, Nebraska, April 25, 1917

Respectfully submitted,

Clara S. Paine, *Secretary-Treasurer*

THE VALUE OF THE MEMOIR OF GEORGE ROGERS CLARK AS AN HISTORICAL DOCUMENT

The original of the document known as Clark's memoir is in the possession of the Wisconsin historical society.[1] It consists of 128 pages of manuscript and purports to give a detailed account of events with which Clark was connected in Virginia, Kentucky, and the northwest from the close of the year 1773 to September, 1779. Attention was first called to the memoir by Mann Butler in his *History of Kentucky* published in 1834.[2] John B. Dillon, who owned a copy, made extensive use of it in his *Historical notes of the discovery and settlement of the territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio.* This volume, which was published in 1843, contains extracts from the document. The memoir was published almost entire by Mr. Dillon in his *History of Indiana.* The entire document was printed for the first time, in 1896, by W. H. English in his *Conquest of the northwest.*[3]

Early writers on the period, following Mann Butler, have accepted this narrative of events by Clark as trustworthy. Dillon accepted the facts as stated in the memoir, and novelists such as Winston Churchill in *The crossing* and Maurice Thompson in *Alice of old Vincennes* adopted the statements without criticism; in fact the substance of these novels is made up largely from this source.[4] The value of the memoir as an historical source was

[1] Two manuscript copies of the memoir are in existence. One, which formerly belonged to John B. Dillon, is in the possession of the estate of W. H. English, Indianapolis. The other was owned by Colonel Reuben T. Durrett of Louisville, but is now the property of the university of Chicago.

[2] It is said that Mann Butler owned the original. William Hayden English, *Conquest of the country northwest of the river Ohio, 1778-1783; and life of Gen. George Rogers Clark* (Indianapolis, 1896), 1: 456.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1: 457-555.

[4] Dillon wrote: "Extracted from the MS. 'Memoirs of General George Rogers Clark, composed by himself at the united desire of Presidents Jefferson and Madison.'" John B. Dillon, *A history of Indiana, from its earliest exploration by Europeans to the close of the territorial government, in 1816* (Indianapolis, 1859), 115.

first questioned by Theodore Roosevelt in *The winning of the west*. Evidently accepting the view of Dillon as to the time when it was written, Mr. Roosevelt says: "It was written at the desire of Presidents Jefferson and Madison; and therefore some thirty or forty years after the events of which it speaks. Valuable though it is, as the narrative of the chief actor, it would be still more valuable had it been written earlier; it undoubtedly contains some rather serious errors." Again Mr. Roosevelt describes the memoir as "written by an old man who had squandered his energies and sunk into deserved obscurity." Elsewhere, he writes: "Unfortunately, most of the small western historians who have written about Clark have really damaged his reputation by the absurd inflation of their language; They were adepts in the forcible-feeble style of writing, a sample of which is their rendering him ludicrous by calling him 'the Hannibal of the West,' and the 'Washington of the West.' Moreover, they base his claims to greatness not on his really great deeds, but on the half-imaginary feats of childish cunning he related in his old age."[5]

While it would be futile to attempt to prove that the memoir is wholly trustworthy, it is regarded as worth the effort to try to determine, first, when it was written; and, second, what portions may be approved.

In the correspondence carried on between Clark and John Brown, delegate in congress from Kentucky, it is shown that at least one hundred pages, the greater part of the memoir, were written in the years 1789 and 1790. The essential portions of these letters follow:

New York, July 5th, 1789.[6]

Dear Gen^{L},

. . . I must beg that you will pardon the liberty which I am going to take. I have a request to make of you and as it is one of consequence, I must premise that I am not only seconded in makeing it but urged to it by some of the most important Characters in the Union — it is — that

[5] Theodore Roosevelt, *The winning of the west* (New York, 1889), 2: 36, 55, 82, notes.

[6] The original is in the Draper manuscript collection, 53 J 80. The significance of this correspondence between Clark and Brown was first noticed by Miss Minnie G. Cook, who printed part of it in the *Virginia magazine of history and biography*, 15: 205.

you will favor the World with a Narrative of your Campaigns in the Western Country. The United States now find themselves in possession of a territory N.W. of the Ohio of vast extent & of immense value to which all turn their Eyes as being the only certain fund for the discharge of the National Debt and although it is confest by all that we owe it to your enterprise & successful exertions, yet the incredible Difficulties & Dangers you incountered, and the gallant exploits which led to & secured the acquisition are but partially & imperfectly known. All wish to know it & you alone are in possession of this Information & should you decline to communicate it the latest Posterity will regret the loss of what would constitute the most interesting Pages in the Annals of the Western World & would be an ornament to the History of the American Revolution. Mr. Madison whose literary and Political Character now attracts the attention of all America is so much engaged in the success of this application that he has desired me to inform you that to lessen the task, if you will furnish the material & it is agreeable to you he will carefully attend to the arrangement & style so as to usher it into the world in a Dress suitable to the importance of the Subject.

You cannot be too minute in the details of the Causes and effects, of Views and Measures, of occurrances and transactions during those successful campaigns. Circumstances & facts which may appear unimportant to you will not be thought so by others. Copies of the Letters which passed between you & the Executive of Virginia of Treaties with & of speeches to & from the Indians may be inserted with great propriety, an 'tis important to preserve them & they must necessarily throw great light upon the Subject. . . .

Sir Yr. Mo Hble Servt.

J. Brown.

Genl G. R. Clark

Louisville, Jan. 20th, 1789 [1790] [7]

Dear Sir:

Your favor of the 5th July came safe to hand. . . . The requisition you make, Sir, by your letter, is such, that a compliance will be in some degree, destroying a resolution that I have long concluded on, that of burying the rise and progress of the War in this quarter in oblivion; which is in my power as all light cast on it by another person, must be faint indeed. Great part of the most material papers are either lost, or made use of as waste paper, and finding my nature such that it was impossible for me to be void of some affection for the people I

[7] This letter and the two others from Clark which follow were printed in the *Commonwealth* (Frankfort, Kentucky), July 25, 1838. Draper manuscripts, 27 CC 29.

had suffered so much for, in the establishment of their interests, that I have frequently destroyed papers that were of such a nature that the reading of them would in some measure cool that spark that still remained, and tend to aggravate the crime of the people — that by having nothing about me that might frequently fall in my way and renew my ideas, and by attempting, if possible, to forget the various transactions that have happened, I might again reconcile myself to live in a country that I was always fond of, and with people whose prosperity I have, until lately, studied with delight. For the want of these helps alluded to, it would require time and recollection to collect materials necessary to compose a true narrative of this department. Some papers I can collect, and will immediately set about this business, and as soon as finished, enclose them to you, probably in four or five months. I shall take no other pains than that of stating facts, and occurrences, &c. If this is to make its appearance in the world, there is no person I could be more happy in their handling the subject than Mr. Madison. You will be pleased to favor me in presenting my most sincere thanks to that gentleman for his expression in my favor.

Yours, with much esteem,

Geo. R. Clark.

The Hon. John Brown.

Jefferson, July 15th, 1790.

Dear Sir: —

. . . As to the Narrative; I have been at a great deal of trouble in attempting to recover several copies, that I was in hopes were in the hands of Captains Harrison and Brashears, at the Natchez, and others, but found myself disappointed, and have set about the business without those helps, have tasked myself to spend two days in the week, and have got through about one hundred pages. I wish, before I close this business, to receive every querie of importance on the subject that yourself and Mr. Madison could imagine. The more I enter into this business, the better I am pleased at the undertaking, and frequently, I suppose, experience the same feeling that actuated me at the time of those transactions. I believe, that through myself, every thing past, relative to this country may be known. If this should fortunately meet with a quick passage, I may probably get an answer from you in two months. Judging from the progress I make, to be nearly closing this business by that period.

Please present my respects to Mr. Madison.

Am, Sir, y'r hble ser'vt

Geo. R. Clark.

JEFFERSON, July 29, 1790.

DEAR SIR:

In my last, of this inst., I informed you of the progress I have made in the narrative you wish for. I have advanced but slowly for the want of papers that have been destroyed by one means or other. Of course I require more study and recollection to go on with this business. The papers relative to the years '78 and '79 are those that I have been at the greatest loss for. Some, I have recovered. In the Winter of 1779, on the request of Col. G. Mason, of Fairfax, I wrote him a pamphlet that contained great part of our proceedings up to that time. I have wrote to him for it, in hopes that he might find it among his old papers, but have got no answer from him. As he is convenient to you, by post, I should thank you to try and recover it for me and send it by the first opportunity. If I get this, I shall be tolerably complete, and correct in what I have done.

I am, Sir, y'r h'ble servant.

GEO. R. CLARK.

THE HON. JOHN BROWN.

NEW YORK 27th April 1790.[8]

DEAR GENERAL

. . . Your favor of the 20th August signifying your willingness to favor the World with a Narrative of your Campaigns in the Western Country gave me as well as many of your friends in this quarter great pleasure. I hope you have not relinquished a work which would make so important an addition to the History of the Revolution. Mr. Madison will chearfully undertake to revise & arrange the collection of facts should you please to put it into his Hands but begs you to desend in the recital even to minutia. . . .

I am with sentiments of esteem Your friend & Hble Ser^{t}

J. BROWN

GENL CLARK

PHILAD^{A} 8th Dec^{r} 1790.[9]

DEAR GENERAL

I had not the pleasure to receive your letters of the 15th and 29 of July untill yesterday. They had been detained with all my other letters written from Kentucke since that date by my Brother near Staunton in expectation of my paying him a visit during the late recess of Congress. But a tour which I made through Vermont & the Eastern States prevented me of that pleasure & also of writing to you more

[8] The original is in the Draper manuscripts, 53 J 88.

[9] The original is in the Draper manuscripts, 53 J 89.

frequently. It affords real satisfaction to me as also to Mr. Madison (to whom I have communicated the contents of your letters) to find you have made so great progress in compiling your Narrative of the Western Campaigns. I hope you will persevere to the completion of this interesting work which I am fully persuaded will make an important addition to the History of the American Revolution. Neither Mr. Madison nor myself can undertake to propose queries to you not being sufficiently acquainted with the subject, but we fully unite in the request that in collecting materials you will not use a sparing hand. Many things may appear very interesting to others which you might think unimportant & any redundancy which may be thus created can easily be retrenched upon a revisal. By next Post I shall write to Col° Mason for the Pamphlet you mention & should it come to hand I shall be carful to forward it to you by the first opportunity. . . .

I am with great respect Yours &c

J. Brown.

General Geo. R. Clark

From the correspondence between Jefferson and Judge Innes of Kentucky it appears probable that the memoir was completed during the year 1791. "Will it not be possible," wrote Jefferson, March 7, 1791, "for you to bring General Clark forward? I know the greatness of his mind & am the more mortified at the cause which obscures it. Had not this unhappily taken place, there was nothing he might not have hoped: could it be surmounted, his lost ground might yet be recovered. No man alive rated him higher than I did, & would again, were he to become again what I knew him. We are made to hope he is engaged in writing the account of his expeditions north of Ohio. They will be valuable morsels of history, and will justify to the world those who have told them how great he was." Judge Innes replied on May 30, 1791, as follows: "Since the reception of your letter I have seen Genl Clark and find he is writing the History of his Expeditions and will complete the work in the course of this summer."[10]

The period between 1786 and 1789 was for Clark one of disappointment and bitterness. He had failed in his expedition against the Indians on the Wabash. The confiscation of the property of some Spanish traders at Vincennes during the same

[10] Jefferson, *Writings* (Ford edition — New York, 1895), 5: 295; *Virginia magazine of history and biography*, 15: 205-213.

year, 1786, subjected him to open criticism by the governor and council of Virginia. His accounts against the state had not been settled and creditors were striving to collect claims for which he had become personally responsible during the course of the revolution.

That Clark during these years at times drank to excess cannot be doubted, but there is ample evidence to show that he was still in possession of his former physical and mental strength. He gives a glimpse of his own life in a letter to his brother, September 2, 1791, in which he says: "for several years I have lived quite retired reading hunting fishing and fowling hath been my genl amusement and corresponding with a few close friends in different parts of the continent and attention to my private business without concerning myself with that of the Publick, in any point of View."[11]

At that time he was greatly interested, as he said, "in an invention that will give a new turn to the face of things throughout the Western country." His application for governmental protection, in which he included a rough description of the mechanical process for navigating a boat, was sent to John Brown. "Not being able," he wrote, "to discover any defect, and further to satisfy myself, I had the machine actually made on a small scale and proved every conjecture beyond a doubt." For what reason Clark did not complete his application for a patent right as provided in the act of congress forwarded to him cannot be determined.[12]

It is not surprising that the Indian problem of the period appealed to him and his vigorous nature stood out in the policy which he advocated. There was in his plan the same elements of thoroughness that always characterized his actions in the Indian councils. To him, the policy of the general government, which consisted in inviting the Indians to make treaties, in giving them presents, and in courting their friendship, was in large measure a failure. "Excell them," he said, "if possible, in their own policy, treat them with indifference, make war on them, prosecute it with all the vigor and devastation possible, mention nothing of peace to them, and you would soon have

[11] Draper manuscripts, 2 L 29.

[12] This was sent by Brown, April 27, 1790. *Ibid.*, 27 CC 29, 53 J 88.

them suing for mercy. Turn the scale upon them and oblige them to give up a part of their country to pay for the expense of the war, &c. All other policy in the Indian department, except something similar to this, is the result of the want of judgment or information."[13]

The letter relating to the death of Logan's family was written nine years after the time when he was engaged on the memoir.[14] This letter has been accepted as among the most trustworthy evidence on that episode. Referring to Clark at that time, Samuel Brown, through whom the letter was secured, wrote Jefferson: "To those who have the happiness of being acquainted with that truly great man, his statement will bring the fullest conviction. His memory is singularly accurate, his veracity unquestionable. To such a respectable authority I can suppose no one capable of objecting, except Mr. Luther Martin."

John Pope describes an interview with Clark during 1791 as follows: "Arrived at his house under an apprehension that he had forgotten me. He immediately recognized me and without ceremony, entered into a highly familiar though desultory conversation, in which I was highly pleased with the Atticism of his wit, the genuine offspring of native genius. On serious and important occasions, he displays a profundity of judgment aided by reflection and matured by experience."[15]

In the further attempt to reach some conclusion on the trustworthiness of the memoir comparison has been made, wherever possible, with other documents of the period. Among these sources, which have passed unchallenged, are Clark's diary, Clark's letter to George Mason, known as the Mason letter, Clark's journal, and Bowman's journal. Proof is abundant that Clark, when he undertook to write the memoir, strove to collect all his correspondence which bore on the various phases discussed. That, so far as possible, he made use of this correspondence is evident from his annotations, such as: "See my letter to him [governor of Virginia]," "Refer to Majr Bowman's Journal," and "This copy is lost."

[13] August 20, 1789. Draper manuscripts, 27 CC 29.

[14] For the account of this letter, see James A. James, *George Rogers Clark papers, 1771-1781* (*Illinois historical collections*, vol. 8 — Springfield, 1912), 3-5.

[15] John Pope, *A tour through the southern and western territories of the United States of North-America* (Richmond, 1792), 19.

The diary and Bowman's journal were in his possession. Clark tried unsuccessfully to locate the Mason letter,[16] and his journal[17] was in the possession of the British. The narrative of events in the memoir, between December 25, 1776, when ten men went to the Ohio river to bring on the gunpowder which Clark had secured from the Virginia legislature for the defense of Kentucky, to March 30, 1778, when he was prepared to descend the Ohio on the Illinois expedition, shows a close adherence to the statements given in the diary. On December 29, 1776, McClelland's Fort was attacked by the Indians, Harrodsburg on March 7, 1777, and numerous other attacks on the white settlements followed. Benjamin Linn and Samuel Moore, who had been sent as special agents by Clark, returned on June 22 with an account of conditions in the French villages of the Illi-

[16] The original manuscript of this letter is now in the possession of Mr. R. C. Ballard Thruston, of Louisville, Kentucky. The location of the letter was unknown for a number of years. Clark's correspondence at the time he was writing the memoir was published in the *Frankfort Commonwealth* towards the close of the year 1826 and called attention to it. Lyman C. Draper, with this clue, took up the search for the missing document and wrote to Colonel George Mason, who was living at Hollin Hall, Virginia, the family home. Colonel Mason replied, February 8, 1827: "The narrative, to which you refer, written by Col. George Rogers Clark & sent to my Grand-Father is in my possession. It is not only a highly interesting, but very valuable document; and I have long since destined it for the safe keeping of some Public Institution. I cannot therefore, consign it to the hands of any Individual, much less those of an entire Stranger, as you are to me Sir — for individual purposes. It will soon be presented to the Historical Society of Kentucky; and it will then be at their discretion to give you, or any other Gentleman, access to it." In a postscript, dated February 10, he stated that the manuscript had that day been sent to that institution. When the Kentucky historical society dissolved the Mason letter came into possession of the Honorable Henry Pirtle, then president of the society. It was published in 1869, with an introduction by Mr. Pirtle, as *Col. George Rogers Clark's sketch of his campaign in the Illinois in 1778-9* (*Ohio valley historical series*, no. 3 — Cincinnati, 1869); by English in his *Conquest of the northwest*, 1: 411-453; and in James, *George Rogers Clark papers*, 114-154.

[17] The journal gives the earliest known account of events connected with the capture of Vincennes after February 23, 1779. William Myers, the bearer of this official message to Governor Henry, was killed by the Indians near the falls of the Ohio. According to custom the Indian agents, instead of sending the originals of important captured letters to their superior officers, forwarded copies of such portions as they chose to select. A copy of the journal taken from the Canadian archives was published in the *American historical review*, 1: 91-94. Three weeks after the death of Myers, Clark prepared another account of the capture of Vincennes, one copy of which was sent to Governor Henry and the other to Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson, *Writings* (Washington edition — New York, 1853), 1: 222.

nois country. The arrival of Colonel John Bowman at Harrodsburg on September 2 with a company of men from Virginia gave renewed courage to the defenders of Kentucky. On October 1 Clark set out for Virginia in order to make an appeal to the governor for aid in the defense of these settlements. Governor Patrick Henry favored granting this request and on January 2 Clark received orders for carrying it into effect. Twelve hundred pounds of public money were granted for the use of the expedition, and on January 4 Clark set out for Fort Pitt where he received supplies from General Hand, the commandant at that post.

In testing the narrative of the memoir between March 30, 1778, the date when the diary ends, and January 29, 1779, when Bowman's journal begins, comparison is made with the Mason letter. As already stated, Clark did not possess this document.

On March 29 Clark received a message from Major William Bailey Smith containing the information that he had recruited four companies of men on the Holston river and was sending them to Kentucky. Two companies under Captain Joseph Bowman and Captain Leonard Helm were to join Clark at Redstone. On May 12, with one hundred and fifty frontiersmen, together with a number of private adventurers and some twenty settlers with their families, Clark set out from Redstone.[18] After taking on stores at Pittsburgh, liberally granted by General Hand, and at Wheeling, they proceeded cautiously down the Ohio, not knowing when they might be surprised by Indian war parties. Reaching the mouth of the Kanawha, they learned that this post had been attacked by the Indians the day before.[19] Descending the river, they were joined by Captain James O'Hara with his company who were on their way to the Arkansas on "publick business."[20] The mouth of the Kentucky,

[18] James, *George Rogers Clark papers,* 27 (diary), 117 (Mason letter), 220 (memoir). The memoir says "late in may"; also that he was accompanied by three companies of men. Each of these companies contained fifty men. Major Smith's companies were to contain two hundred men.

[19] *Ibid.,* 117 (Mason letter), 220 (memoir). The memoir says 250 Indians, and the Mason letter, "a large Body of Indians." Joseph Bowman to George Brinker, July 30, 1778: "by a superior body of Indians — appearing to be about two hundred in number." *Ibid.,* 614.

[20] *Ibid.,* 117 (Mason letter), 221 (memoir). The Mason letter says, "on his way to the Ozark." General Hand to General Horatio Gates, April 24, 1778: "I am

where they landed, was at first selected by Clark as a suitable spot to fortify as a protection for immigrants coming down the river. But the falls of the Ohio, while fulfilling this requirement, would in addition furnish the site for a fort necessary to protect the Kentucky settlements and the Illinois country.[21] On May 27, they reached the falls where Clark learned that instead of the four companies expected from the Holston only part of a company under Captain Dillard had arrived in Kentucky.[22] At first, Clark took possession of an island in the rapids in order the more easily to prevent desertions. Then for the first time he disclosed to his followers the real object of the expedition. Because of dissatisfaction among the Holston men the boats were guarded to prevent their escape. A few men escaped but some of them were captured by horsemen the next day.[23] On June 26, they set off from the falls and on the fourth day reached the mouth of the Tennessee where final preparations were made for the march to Kaskaskia.[24] The boats were concealed near Fort Massac and the expedition proceeded in a northwesterly course. The events which followed were: the guide became bewildered and lost the route but soon located it again,[25] the arrival within three miles of Kaskaskia on July 4,[26] boats were secured by which they crossed the river and then captured the town.[27] Clark delayed making his proclamation to the people for a few days, and meantime Captain Joseph Bowman, on July 8, captured Cahokia.[28] The other Illinois villages fol-

preparing to send Capt. O'Hara with a detachment to the Arkansas with the provisions for Capt. Willing.'' Reuben G. Thwaites and Louise P. Kellogg, *Frontier defense on the upper Ohio, 1777-1778* (*Draper series,* vol. 3 — Madison, 1912), 278.

21 James, *George Rogers Clark papers,* 117 (Mason letter), 221 (memoir). The Mason letter says, ''after spending a day or two, We set out,'' while the memoir gives the reasons for choosing the falls of the Ohio as a suitable place to fortify.

22 The Mason letter gives the name ''Delland'' and also ''Dillard.'' *Ibid.,* 118.

23 *Ibid.,* 118 (Mason letter), 222, 223 (memoir).

24 The memoir does not give the day in June, but the Mason letter says that it was June 26. *Ibid.,* 118, 223.

25 *Ibid.,* 119 (Mason letter), 226 (memoir).

26 Mason letter: ''we got within three miles of the Town Kaskaskias.'' Memoir: ''within a few miles of the Town.'' *Ibid.,* 119, 227.

27 The Mason letter says Clark divided his men into two divisions, the memoir, three. *Ibid.,* 120, 227.

28 The memoir gives ''Majr Bowman,'' and the Mason letter, ''Capt Bowman.'' *Ibid.,* 122, 232, 233.

lowed the example of Kaskaskia and Cahokia by taking the oath of allegiance to the United States. Friendly correspondence was begun with the Spanish officer at St. Louis and Father Gibault brought about the transfer of authority at Vincennes. Clark deceived the French by his statement that the troops he had brought with him were only a detachment of the larger army stationed at the falls of the Ohio. For five weeks, Clark was engaged in treating with the Indian tribes assembled at Cahokia.[29]

Word was received by Clark that an expedition was to move from Pittsburgh against Detroit.[30] Captain Helm was authorized to proceed to Ouiatanon with a party of men in order to counteract the influence of a British agent at that post. The expedition was successful in that from twenty to thirty Chippewa warriors were captured, but the British emissary escaped.[31] With the setting-in of winter preparations were begun at Detroit for an expedition which was at first thought by Clark to be intended against the army from Pittsburgh, but which he later learned was to come against the Illinois towns.[32]

For the events between January 29, 1779, when Colonel Francis Vigo gave information on the capture of Vincennes, to March 20 of the same year, when Clark returned to Kaskaskia after his victory over Hamilton, the sources in addition to the memoir and the Mason letter are Bowman's journal, Clark's journal, and Hamilton's report.[33] In a marginal note by Clark

[29] James, *George Rogers Clark papers*, 122, 125-129 (Mason letter), 234-238, 243-261 (memoir).

[30] *Ibid.*, 131 (Mason letter), 259 (memoir).

[31] Mason letter: "but a few days before the Captains arrival Mr Celeron thought proper to make his Escape . . . About forty in number being made Prisoners." Memoir: "the Emisary (I forget his name)." *Ibid.*, 130, 259.

[32] Mason letter: "A Young Man at the Town of Cohos holding a Correspondance and sending Intilligence to Governour Hambletons Party was Detected & punished accordingly." Memoir: "one Denny an Inhabitant of Kohokia was taken up by Majr Bowman for writing through the Indians to his friend near DeTroit given dangerous Information his Letters was intercepted and him self tied to the tail of a Cart and by drum Received a lash at every Door in Town and Burnt in the Hand for other Misdemeneours." *Ibid.*, 132, 261.

[33] Major Joseph Bowman was one of Clark's most trusted associates. His journal gives a brief statement of the important events between January 29 and March 20, 1779. *Ibid.*, 155-164. The original of this document has not been located. There is a copy in the Draper manuscripts of the Wisconsin historical society, 47 J 131. Another copy is in the Congressional library, in Letters to Washington, 1779,

in the memoir he says: "Refer to Majr Bowman's Journal for the particulars of this march." While there can be no doubt that this journal was carefully followed by Clark, there are a number of incidents not mentioned therein which are included in the memoir and the Mason letter.

The afternoon of February 23, when they reached the Warrior's island, within two miles of Vincennes, is referred to as a "delightful day."[34] Here they captured a hunter from Vincennes. Clark used this prisoner "who was not permited to see our numbers" to carry a letter to the inhabitants of the village.[35] Several of his men also "sent ther Compliments to ther Friends under borrowed Names well known at St Vincents and the person supposed to have been at Kentucky."[36]

About sundown, Clark ordered the march to begin with colors flying and drums braced. By marching to and fro, a slight elevation of land obstructing the view so that only the flags could be seen from the town, the impression was made that a force of one thousand men was approaching.[37]

fol. 91. The journal has been published in the *Louisville Literary News*, November 24, 1840, in *Clark's campaign in the Illinois*, and in English, *Conquest of the northwest*, 1: 568. The report prepared by Lieutenant Governor Hamilton covers events from November, 1776, to June, 1781. The original is in the British museum. See James, *George Rogers Clark papers*, 174-207.

[34] Mason letter: "Laying in this Grove some time to dry our Clothes by the Sun." *Ibid.*, 141.

[35] Mason letter: "but would not suffer him to see our Troops except a few." Memoir: "the soldiers all had instructions that ther common conversation when speaking of our Numbers should be such that a stranger overhearing must suppose that their was near 1000 of us." *Ibid.*, 141, 278.

[36] Mason letter: "Sending the Compliments of several Officers that was known to be Expected to reinforce me, to several Gentlemen of the Town." *Ibid.*, 141.

[37] Mason letter: "I march'd time enough to be seen from the Town before dark but taking advantage of the Land, disposed the lines in such a manner that nothing but the Pavilions could be seen, having as many of them as would be sufficient for a thousand Men, which was observed by the Inhabitants, who had Just Receiv'd my letter counted the different Colours and Judged our number accordingly But I was careful to give them no oppertunity of seeing our Troops before dark, which it would be before we could Arrive." Memoir: "Raising Volunteers in the Illinois every person that set about the business must have a set of Colurs given him which they brought with them to the amt of 10 or 12 pair these ware displayed to the best advantage and as the Low plain we mach through was not a perfect level but have frequent Risings in it of Seven or Eight Feet higher than the common Level which was covered with Water and they Genly Run in an oblique direction to the Town we took the advantage of on[e] of them march through the Water under it which compleatly prevented our Men being Numbered but our

So completely were the British surprised that Lieutenant Governor Hamilton was not aware of the approach of the enemy and believed the rifle shots to have been fired by drunken Indians until one of his men was wounded by a shot fired through a port hole. A Piankeshaw, son of the chief of that tribe, tendered Clark the services of one hundred warriors but the offer was declined.[38] The firing was almost continuous throughout the night.[39] Captain Lamothe had been sent out by Hamilton on a scouting expedition. On returning some of his men were

Colours shewed considerably above the height as they ware fixed to long poles procured for the purpose and at a distance made no despicable appearance and as our young frenchmen had while we lay on the Warriours Island decoyed and taken several Fowlers with their Horses officers ware mounted on those and Rode about more compleatly to deceiv the Enemy in this manner we moved and directed our march in such a manner as to suffer it to be dark before had avanced more than half way to the Town.'' James, *George Rogers Clark papers,* 141, 279.

Thwaites, in his *How George Rogers Clark won the northwest* (Chicago, 1903), 56, quotes: ''but taking advantage of the Land, disposed the lines in such a manner that nothing but the Pavilions [doubtless shelter huts of boughs] could be seen, having as many of them as would be sufficient for a thousand Men.'' One definition of ''pavilion'' is, ''a movable or open structure for temporary shelter.'' This probably gave Thwaites his interpretation, ''shelter huts of boughs.'' In the second edition of his book (Chicago, 1904), however, Thwaites has changed his explanation to, ''referring to the enemy's banners.''

On this point Roosevelt prefers to follow Clark's journal in place of the Mason letter which had been previously accepted by him. Referring to Clark's journal, he writes: ''This is not only the official report, but also the earliest letter Clark wrote on the subject and therefore the most authoritative. The paragraph relating to the final march against Vincennes is as follows: 'At sundown I put the divisions in motion to march in the greatest order & regularity & observe the orders of their officers. Above all to be silent — the 5 men we took in the canoes were our guides.' '' Roosevelt continues, ''This effectually disposes of the account, which was accepted by Clark himself in his old age, that he ostentatiously paraded his men and marched them to and fro with many flags flying, so as to impress the British with his numbers. Instead of indulging in any such childishness (which would merely have warned the British, and put them on their guard), he in reality made as silent an approach as possible, under cover of the darkness.'' Roosevelt, *The winning of the west,* 2: 78, n. 2. This does not dispose, however, of the deception, the details of which are given in both the Mason letter and the memoir.

For the tradition of a somewhat similar march see Claude H. Van Tyne, *The American revolution* (*The American nation; a history,* vol. 9 — New York, 1905), 283; Edmund Flagg, ''The far west; or, a tour beyond the mountains,'' in Reuben G. Thwaites, *Early western travels,* 27: 88.

[38] James, *George Rogers Clark papers,* 142 (Mason letter), 280, 281 (memoir).

[39] Mason letter: ''Never was a heavier fireing kept up on both sides for eighteen Hours with so little damage done.'' Memoir: ''and the firing continued without Intermission (except about 15 minutes a little before Day).'' *Ibid.,* 142, 281.

made prisoners, and Clark, finding that he could not capture the whole party, withdrew his troops shortly before daybreak to allow their entrance into the fort.[40] About nine o'clock Clark sent a messenger to Hamilton demanding the surrender of the fort, for he was especially solicitous about letters from Virginia which the British had taken with two prisoners the day before.[41] There followed the conference at the little French church and an agreement on the terms of surrender.[42] Clark's men clamored for the capture of Detroit but he wished to add to his

[40] Mason letter: "Capt Lemote was sent out to intercept them; being out on our Arival could not get in the Fort." Hamilton's report: "we despaired of Captain La Mothe's party regaining the fort, but to our great surprize and joy about half-an-hour before sunrise they appear'd and got into the Fort over the Stockades which were upright, and 11 feet out of the ground." Memoir: "after some deliberation on the subject we concluded to Risque the Reinforcement in preference to his going again among the Indians . . . a little before Day the Troops was withdrawn from the Fort except a few parties." *Ibid.*, 142, 186, 283, 284.

Roosevelt says, "Clark in his 'Memoir' asserts that he designedly let them through, and could have shot them down as they tried to clamber over the stockade if he had wished. Bowman corroborates Hamilton, saying: 'We sent a party to intercept them, but missed them. However, we took one of their men, . . . the rest making their escape under the cover of the night into the fort.' Bowman's journal is for this siege much more trustworthy than Clark's 'Memoir.' In the latter, Clark makes not a few direct misstatements, and many details are colored so as to give them an altered aspect." Roosevelt, *The winning of the west*, 2: 81, n. 2.

[41] Mason letter: "knowing of the Prisoners lately taken and by the discription I had of them I was sure of their being the Express from Williamsburg (but was mistaken) to save the papers and Letters." Bowman's journal: "about 9 O Clock the Col. sent a flag to Govr Hamilton." Clark's journal: "about 8 o'clock I sent a flag of truce with a letter." Memoir: "about nine Oclock in the morning of the 24th Learning that the two prisoners they had brought in the Day before had a considerable number of Letters with them I supposed it an Express that we expected about this time which I new to be of the greatest moment to us as we had not received one Since our arrival in the countrey and not being fully acquainted with the character of our Enemy we ware doubtfull that those papers might be destroyed to prevent which I sent a flag Demanding the Garison and desiring Govr Hamilton not to destroy them with some threats in case he did if his Garison should fall into my Hands his answer was that they ware not disposed to be awed into any thing unbecoming British Subjects." James, *George Rogers Clark papers*, 143, 160, 165, 285.

[42] *Ibid.*, 143, 144, 145 (Mason letter), 162 (Bowman's journal), 167 (Clark's journal), 286, 287, 288, 289 (memoir). Clark's journal: "I told Capt Helm Sir you are a prisoner on your parole, I desire you to reconduct G. H. into the Fort and there remain till I retake you." Memoir: "Captn Helms attempted to moderate our fixed determination I told him that he was a British prisoner and it was doubtfull whether or not he could with propriety Speak on the subject."

force before undertaking that project.[43] Looking towards gaining the friendship of the French at that post, he paroled the volunteers who had accompanied the British.[44] After dealing with the Indians in the vicinity of Vincennes, Clark returned to Kaskaskia where he overcame an uprising of the Delawares.[45] Clark's disappointment was extreme when, in August, the expedition against Detroit was again postponed because of the failure to respond to his call for troops.[46]

A number of statements made in the Mason letter, dealing chiefly with special days, are corrected in the memoir. Clark set out for Williamsburg October 1, 1777, not in August.[47] Father Gibault and Dr. Laffont started for Vincennes July 14, 1778.[48] Clark's expedition left Kaskaskia for Vincennes February 5, 1779.[49]

[43] James, *George Rogers Clark papers*, 146 (Mason letter), 290-293 (memoir). Memoir: "Kentuck we new could immediately furnish perhaps 200 Men." Mason letter: "did not doubt of getting two or three hundred Men from Kentucky."

[44] Memoir: "A compleat company of Volunteers from DeTroit of Cap^{tn} Lamoths mostly composed of young men was drawn up and when expecting to be sent of into a strange cuntrey and probaly never again returning . . . and that as we new that sending them to the States whare they would be confined in a Jail probably for the course of the war would make a great number of our Friends at DeTroit unhappy we had thought proper for their sakes to suffer them to return home . . . in a few Days they set out (and as we had spies that went among them as Traders we learned that they made great havack to the British interest on their return." *Ibid.*, 291.

[45] *Ibid.*, 149 (Mason letter), 298 (memoir).

[46] Mason letter: "Receiving letters from Col^{o} Bowman at Kentucky informing me that I might expect him to Reinforce me with three hund^{d} men. . . . on my arrival at S^{t} Vincents the first of July, instead of two or three hundred Men that I was promised; I found only about thirty Volunteers, meeting with a Repulse from the Shawnees got discouraged Consequently not in the power of the Com^{d} to March them as Militia, being for some time, (as I hinted before) suspitious of a disappointment, I had conducted matters so as to make no Ill impression on the minds of the Savages in case I should not proceed as the whole had suspected that my design was against Detroit." Memoir: "I received and express from Kentucky wharin Col Bowman informed me that he could furnish 300 good men . . . my self with a party of Horse reached the opost in four Days . . . Instead of 300 Men from Kentucky thare appeared about 30 Volunteers commanded by Cap^{tn} McGary . . . Col. Bowman had turned his attention against the Shawnees Town and got repulsed and his men discouraged." *Ibid.*, 150, 299, 300.

[47] *Ibid.*, 115 (Mason letter), 218 (memoir). Clark's diary gives October 1, 1777. *Ibid.*, 24.

[48] *Ibid.*, 238 (memoir). Clark gave his instructions to Dr. Laffont, July 14. Mason letter: "In a few days the Priest, Doct^{r} Lefont, the Principal, with a few others set out." *Ibid.*, 53, 122.

[49] Mason letter: "By the 4th day of Janu^{y} I got every thing Compleat and on the

The narrative of the memoir may be tested in still another way for it is to be noted that there are here numerous statements of fact not corroborated by any of the following four documents: Clark's diary, the Mason letter, Clark's journal, or Bowman's journal, but the truth of which is confirmed by other documents of the time. As we have seen, the date of the first entry in the diary is December 25, 1776. Clark's relation to the west during the preceding two years is described in the memoir, constituting eight printed pages. So far as it has been possible to make a comparison, only a minor error in a date has been noted.[50] The attempt to settle Kentucky by James Harrod and his associates during the spring of 1774 and their return to the site of Harrodsburg after Dunmore's war;[51] the purchase of land by Colonel Richard Henderson from the Cherokee and the settlement of Boonesborough;[52] Clark's coming to Kentucky as a surveyor for the Ohio company early in 1775;[53] his determination to contest the claims of Colonel Henderson and the meeting at Harrodsburg in which Clark and Jones were elected delegates to the Virginia assembly;[54] the application to Governor Henry and the Virginia council for five hundred pounds of powder for the defense of Kentucky and the return to Kentucky with the powder which had been stored at Pittsburgh.[55]

Similarly, it is seen that on later events the memoir is not only more complete than either of the four sources referred to, but it contains statements supplementary to them. Such are the following: Governor Henry and his conferences with Thomas Jefferson, George Mason, and George Wythe, and their promise

5th I marched." Bowman's journal: "[February] 5th . . . about three O Clock crossed the Kaskaskias River with our Baggage and Marched about a League from the Town." Memoir: "5th of February." *Ibid.*, 139, 156, 269.

50 The general meeting at Harrodsburg for selecting deputies to the Virginia assembly was June 8, 1776, instead of June 6. *Ibid.*, 209 (memoir). For the petition for election, see *ibid.*, 11-13.

51 *Ibid.*, 208 (memoir). For Harrod's settlement, 1774, see Harrison's journal, April 7-9, 1774, in Reuben G. Thwaites and Louise P. Kellogg, *Documentary history of Dunmore's war, 1774* (Madison, 1905), 121.

52 Henderson's journal in *Filson club publications*, 16: 169-180.

53 Clark to Jonathan Clark, April 1, 1775, and July 6, 1775, in James, *George Rogers Clark papers*, 9. See also *ibid.*, 209 (memoir).

54 Clark to Jonathan Clark, February 26, 1776, and the petition from the people of Kentucky. *Ibid.*, 11-16.

55 *Ibid.*, 210-215 (memoir). See also the journal of the executive council, August 23, 1776, in *ibid.*, 18.

to use influence to secure three hundred acres of land for each soldier if the expedition were successful;[56] Henry's secret and public instructions to Clark;[57] order on Pittsburgh for boats and ammunition;[58] on the expedition to Kaskaskia, they "shot the Falls during a total eclipse of the sun;"[59] the letter from Colonel John Campbell, who was at Pittsburgh, announcing the treaty between France and America;[60] circumstances connected with the capture of Cahokia by Joseph Bowman and his occu-

[56] Order of council, January 2, 1778: "The Governor informed the Council that he had had some conversation with several Gentlemen who were well acquainted with the Western Frontiers of Virginia." Letter of Wythe, Mason, and Jefferson to Clark, January 3, 1778: "We think it just & reasonable that each Volunteer entering as a common Soldier in this Expedition, should be allowed three hundred Acres of Land." Memoir: "he had several private Counsills composed of select gent[n] . . . the Expedition was resolved on and as an Incouragement to those that would Ingage in s[d] service and Instrument of writing was sign wharein those Gent[n] promised to use their Influance to procure from the assembly 300 Acres of Land Each in case of suckness." James, *George Rogers Clark papers*, 33, 37, 219.

[57] Memoir: "finding from the Governors conversation to me in Gen[l] upon the subject that he did not wish an implicit attention to his instructions." *Ibid.*, 219. For the "Secret Instructions" and "Public Instructions" to Clark, see *ibid.*, 34, 36.

[58] Patrick Henry to General Edward Hand, January 2, 1778. *Ibid.*, 36.

[59] A letter from W. S. Burnham addressed to Simon Newcomb who was at the time in charge of the National Observatory at Washington, brought the following reply:

WASHINGTON, July 22, 1886.

DEAR SIR: —

I have much pleasure in acknowledging receipt of your letter of July 20th, inquiring whether an eclipse of the sun was visible at Louisville, Ky., about the first of June, 1778.

I find by reference to the ephemenides that on the morning of June 24th, 1778, there was a total eclipse of the sun visible in this country, the moon's shadow passing over the northern part of the Gulf of Mexico.

At Louisville the sun must have been four-fifths or even nine-tenths covered about nine o'clock in the morning. It may interest you to know that this was one of the recurrences of the great eclipse of 1868.

Yours very truly,

S. NEWCOMB

[60] Draper manuscripts, 47 J 22. In a letter written from Pittsburgh Clark was informed of the celebration at that place, May 26, on account of the report that France had acknowledged the independence of the United States; that a treaty of commerce had been made between the representatives of the two nations, and that hostilities between Great Britain and France were to begin. John Campbell to Clark, June 8, 1778, in the *American historical review*, 8: 497. A dispatch announcing the success of the American representatives at Paris was received by congress, May 3, 1778. Francis Wharton, *The revolutionary diplomatic correspondence of the United States* (Washington, 1889), 2: 568.

pancy of the old fort as a means of defense;[61] Clark's relation to Cerré;[62] Winston and Murray were using their influence at Kaskaskia for the Americans;[63] subterfuge used by Clark in his letter to the people of Vincennes;[64] the agreement with Blackbird, chief of the Chippewa;[65] the appearance of the Indian squaws in a canoe having in their possession a quarter of buffalo;[66] the completion of Fort Sackville;[67] supplies of ammunition secured from the French;[68] conference of Clark and Hamilton during which Clark assured Hamilton that the garrison

[61] "I caused a Court of sivil Judicature to be Established at Kohas Elected by the people Majr Bowman to the supprise of the people held a pole for a Majestacy and was Elected and acted as Judge of the Court." James, *George Rogers Clark papers,* 235 (memoir). The early records of this court are given in Clarence W. Alvord, *Cahokia records* (*Illinois historical collections,* vol. 2 — Springfield, 1907), 2-8.

[62] James, *George Rogers Clark papers,* 228 (memoir). Two pages are given to Cerré. The same facts are brought out in a letter from Cerré to Clark, July 11, 1778. *Ibid.,* 47-49. See Clarence W. Alvord, *Kaskaskia records* (*Illinois historical collections,* vol. 5 — Springfield, 1909), 49.

[63] *Ibid.,* 28; James, *George Rogers Clark papers,* 229 (memoir).

[64] *Ibid.,* 238 (memoir). "I have been charmed to learn from a letter written by Governor Abbott to M. Rocheblave that you are in general attached to the cause of America." Clark to the inhabitants of Vincennes, July 13, 1778. *Ibid.,* 52.

[65] Patrick Henry to the Virginia delegates in congress, November 16, 1778: "The Great Blackbird, a Chippewa Chief, has also sent a belt of peace to Col. Clark, influenced, he supposes, by the dread of Detroit's being reduced by the American arms." Memoir: "I told him that I was happy to find that this business was likely to end so much to both our satisfactions and so much to the advantage and Tranquility of Each of our people that I should amediately [write] the Govr of Virginia of what passed betwen us and that I knew that it would give him [and] all the Americans great pleasure." *Ibid.,* 72, 255. See also the Mason letter, in *ibid.,* 129.

[66] *Ibid.,* 276; Roosevelt, *The winning of the west,* 2: 76. In the Clark manuscripts, Virginia state archives, is an order, March 12, 1779, signed by Joseph Bowman, which is as follows: "Issue to that squaw that Furnished our men with Provisions on our way to Attact Governor Hemilton one Bushl Corn and five pounds of Pork."

[67] Hamilton's report: "The fort was on the 22nd of February in a tolerable state of defence the Work proposed being finish'd." Memoir: "we now found that the Garison had known nothing of us that having finished the Fort that eavening." James, *George Rogers Clark papers,* 185, 280.

[68] Hamilton's report: "On our arrival at St. Vincennes a strict search was made for Gunpowder, all that was to be found in the place was put into the Magazine, and a heavy fine was laid on those who should be found to conceal any, nevertheless Colonel Clarke was supplyed by the Inhabitants, his own to the last ounce being damaged on his March." Memoir: "Col Legrass Majr Bosseron and others had buried the Greatest part of their powder and Ball this was amediately produced and we found our selves well supplyed." *Ibid.,* 192, 281.

would fall and that if the defense were persisted in it would not be possible to save a single man.[69]

Detroit then became Clark's objective for the garrison at that post did not exceed eighty men and the majority of the French were disaffected.[70] Until the middle of October, 1779, Clark was at Louisville, from which post he superintended military affairs in the west and prepared for the advance on Detroit.[71]

It is to be noted that many of the documents used in testing the accuracy of statements in the memoir have been made public for the first time within the past few years. But there are other events referred to which cannot thus be tested for they are given in the memoir alone. In the histories of Kentucky and elsewhere, these statements have been accepted without criticism. Such are: the treatment meted out to the men who escaped from Corn island by the inhabitants of Harrodsburg;[72] methods of keeping the men in good spirits such as the assistance of the little "antick drummer";[73] making light of the fears

[69] Hamilton's report: "He told me it was in vain to think of persisting in the defence of the Fort, . . . that if from a spirit of obstinacy I persisted when there was no probability of relief and should stand an Assault, not a single Soul should be spared." Memoir: "I told him . . . That he by this time must be sensible that the Garison would Fall . . . and the Result of an Inraged body of Woodmen breaking in must be obvious to him it would be out of the power of an Amican officer to save a single man." James, *George Rogers Clark papers,* 190, 286.

[70] Clark to Patrick Henry, April 29, 1779: "on hearing of my success against Mr. Hamilton, and were so certain of my embracing the fair opportunity of possessing myself of that post, that the merchants and others provided many necessaries for us on our arrival; the garrison, consisting of only eighty men, not daring to stop their diversions." Memoir: "DeTroit opened full in our View not more than 80 men in the Fort great part of them Invalids and we found that a considerable Number of thar prinsipal Inhabitants was disaffected to the British cause." *Ibid.,* 172, 290.

[71] Memoir: "Col. Rogers who had been sent to the mississippi for a very considerable Quantity of Goo[d]s geting a reinforcement at the Falls on his passage to Pittsburgh, a little above Licking Creek got totally defeated himself and almost the whole of his party consisting of about 70 men were killed or made prisoners among the Latter those of Note ware Col. John Campbell and Cap^{tn} Abraham Chapline." Benjamin Logan to Clark, October 17, 1779: "from the alarming news we have received of the defate of Col^{o} Rodgers & Campble." Robert Todd to Clark, October 16, 1779: "I have by chance heard of the disaster of Col. Rogers and the supposed loss of two Boats which has roused & alarm'd them here not a little." *Ibid.,* 302, 371.

[72] *Ibid.,* 223 (memoir); Roosevelt, *The winning of the west,* 2: 40.

[73] Memoir: "a little Antick Drummer afforded them great divertion by floating

of the volunteers; and Clark's orders to go out and kill some deer. On the twenty-second of February when the men were almost despairing, Clark blackened his face with gunpowder and sprang forward into the icy water. His men followed, taking up the song of those in front. The night of February 23 was so cold that ice from one-half to three-fourths of an inch thick formed on the still water. Clark, at sunrise, promised them that a few hours more would bring them in sight of Vincennes. He then plunged into the water, giving orders to Captain Bowman to take the rear with twenty-five men and shoot any refusing to march. In crossing the Horseshoe Plain, many were saved from drowning by the canoes; others clung to their stronger companions and to logs and bushes. Fires were built when the strongest reached an island but some of the men were restored only as two of their companions took them by the arms and forced them to run up and down. Arriving in sight of the town, a horseman who was out shooting ducks was captured, and from him Clark learned that the fort had been completed, that a large number of Indians had just entered the town, and that the French were lukewarm to the British.[74]

Finally, it is to be noted that certain incidents have been introduced into the account of Clark's conquest, supposedly coming from the memoir, but for which there is no evidence whatsoever in that document. The most familiar and most striking of these, furnishing excellent material for the historical pageantry of our time, are: the description of the dance at Kaskaskia when that post was captured;[75] the defense of Vincennes by

on his Drum &c.'' James, *George Rogers Clark papers*, 271. Writers have enlarged upon this account. ''In one of the companies was a small boy who acted as drummer. In the same company was a sergeant, standing six feet two inches in his stockings, stout, athletic, and devoted to Clark. Finding that his eloquence had no effect upon the men, in persuading them to continue their line of march, Clark mounted the little drummer on the shoulders of the stalwart sergeant, and gave orders to him to plunge into the half frozen water. He did so, the little drummer beating the *charge* from his lofty perch, while Clark, sword in hand, followed them, giving the command as he threw aside the floating ice —'Forward!' Elated and amused by the scene, the men promptly obeyed, holding their rifles above their heads, and in spite of all obstacles, reached the high land beyond them safely.'' John Law, *Colonial history of Vincennes* (Vincennes, 1858), 32, note. See also Thwaites, *How George Rogers Clark won the northwest*, 52.

[74] James, *George Rogers Clark papers*, 272-277 (memoir); Roosevelt, *The winning of the west*, 2: 72-77.

[75] *Ibid.*, 2: 46, note.

Captain Helm and his single companion;[76] their marching out with the honors of war; the story of Helm's drinking toddy at the fire-place in Fort Sackville and Clark's ordering his riflemen to fire at the chimney so as to knock the mortar into the toddy.[77]

It is evident from these tests that the memoir can no longer be thought of as the reminiscences of an old man who strove for the dramatic in his presentation of facts. Although the language is stilted occasionally, especially in the speeches before Indian councils, it is not conspicuously so when compared with the Mason letter and Clark's journal describing similar events. These two documents together with Clark's diary and Bowman's journal will always constitute the main sources for the history of the west during the period between December 25, 1776, and the close of August, 1779. But from the evidence presented it may confidently be asserted that the memoir must be accepted as a trustworthy supplement to each of them, at times, and to all of them on a number of essential points.

James Alton James

Northwestern University
Evanston

[76] "There is an anecdote respecting Captain Leonard Helm, evincing an intrepidity which would ill be omitted: it has been communicated to the author, through the friendly interest of Judge Underwood, and his venerable relative, Edmund Rogers, Esq., of Barren county, a brother of Captain John Rogers, and personally intimate with Clark and his officers for years. It is as follows: when Governor Hamilton entered Vincennes, there were but two Americans there, Captain Helm, the commandant, and one Henry. The latter had a cannon well charged, and placed in the open fort gate, while Helm stood by it with a lighted match in his hand. When Hamilton and his troops got within good hailing distance, the American officer in a loud voice, cried out, 'Halt.' This stopped the movements of Hamilton; who in reply demanded a surrender of the garrison. Helm exclaimed with an oath, 'No man shall enter until I know the terms,' Hamilton answered, 'You shall have the honors of war'; and then the fort was surrendered with its garrison of one officer and one private." Mann Butler, *A history of the commonwealth of Kentucky* (Cincinnati, 1836), 79, note.

[77] "The story of Helm drinking toddy by the fire-place when Clark retook the fort, and of the latter ordering riflemen to fire at the chimney, so as to knock the mortar into the toddy, may safely be set down as pure — and very weak — fiction. When Clark wrote memoirs, in his old age, he took delight in writing down among his exploits all sorts of childish stratagems; the marvel is that any sane historian should not have seen that these were on their face as untrue as they were ridiculous." Roosevelt, *The winning of the west*, 2: 63, note.

THE COMING OF THE CIRCUIT RIDER ACROSS THE MOUNTAINS

There has recently come into my possession the unpublished minutes of the first Methodist conference organized west of the Alleghanies, the Western conference, and their possession has stimulated me to undertake the recounting of the labors of the early circuit riders west of the mountains. My paper will cover the period from the close of the revolution to the year 1811, when this Western conference was divided into two conferences, the Ohio and the Tennessee.

Up until 1784 the Methodist societies in America were under the direct supervision of John Wesley and still considered themselves as belonging to the church of England. Although he was the supervisor of all the Methodist societies in America, Francis Asbury, who had come out to America in 1771 and remained through the revolution, was not an ordained clergyman and had never administered any of the sacraments. For both baptism and the Lord's supper entire dependence was placed upon clergymen of the Anglican church.[1] During the latter years of the war, however, considerable discontent over this situation had grown up among certain of the Methodist preachers, for most of the clergymen had returned to England and the Methodist societies were without the sacraments. In 1779 a number of preachers, mostly from North Carolina and southern Virginia, who had met together, decided to ordain one another, and thereafter proceeded to administer the sacraments. For the sake of peace, however, they agreed to discontinue this practice until Wesley could be consulted. In 1784, a year after the treaty of Paris, Wesley wisely determined that since the United States had achieved independence, it was best for all concerned to separate the Methodist societies in America from the English conference, and in that same year, he sent over Dr. Coke and two other preachers to supervise the organization of the new

[1] Jesse Lee, *A short history of the Methodists in the United States of America; beginning in 1766, and continued till 1809* (Baltimore, 1810), 90.

church.[2] The Methodist Episcopal church, accordingly, dates from what is known as the Christmas conference, which met in Baltimore, December 27, 1784. Here Francis Asbury was elected general superintendent for America, and from this time Methodism extended rapidly into all parts of the United States. At the time of the organization of the church there were 18,000 Methodists in the United States, but in 1816, the year of Asbury's death, the membership had grown to the astonishing number of 224,853.[3]

Both the organization and the doctrine of the Methodists were well suited to meet the needs of the frontier. The system begun by John Wesley was brought to America by Francis Asbury, who came thoroughly saturated with his leader's thoughts and resolutely determined to carry out his plan. When he arrived in America Asbury was urged to settle down in the centers of population, but he had heard the call of the wilderness, and, firmly resolved to carry out the Methodist plan, he set out on "the Long Road, and was still traveling forty-five years later when Death finally caught up with him."[4] Asbury set an example which was followed by an ever increasing army of itinerant preachers. Every Methodist preacher of those early days was an itinerant. Instead of one preaching place he had many, some of the circuits having from twenty to thirty of them. Hence it took a circuit rider from two to six weeks to make his round, preaching once at each place. He was not particular where he held services; a log cabin, or the barroom of a tavern, or out in the woods were all alike to him. He preached wherever he found anyone to listen with little regard to either time or place. Moreover the system of lay or local preachers was one which lent itself easily to the spread of Methodism in a new country. A young man who showed any ability for public speaking was urged by the circuit rider to exercise his talent, and when the presiding elder came around to hold "Quarterly

[2] Lee, *Methodists in the United States*, 69, 70, 91-93; John Wesley's letters setting forth his plan for the organization of the church in America will be found in *Minutes of the annual conferences of the Methodist Episcopal church for the years 1773-1828* (New York, 1840), 1: 21.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1: 297.

[4] John Wesley, *Journal* (London, 1915), 6: 2; Ezra Tipple, *Francis Asbury, the prophet of the long road* (New York, 1916), 158.

Meeting'' the young man was recommended for an ''Exhorter's'' or ''Local preacher's'' license. He did not travel a circuit, but improved every opportunity to preach; consequently the first Methodist classes in many a frontier community were organized by these lay workers before the coming of the regular circuit rider and the presiding elder.[5]

Then, too, the Methodist circuit rider preached a doctrine which appealed greatly to the frontiersmen. It was one of free will and individual responsibility. He brought home to them the fact that they were the masters of their own destinies, as opposed to the Presbyterian doctrine of predestination. Methodist doctrine thus fit in exactly with the new democracy rising in the west, for both emphasized actual equality among all men. On one occasion when he was attending a conference in Nashville, Peter Cartwright was chosen to deliver a sermon in one of the local churches. While he was preaching General Jackson came in, whereupon one of the preachers pulled Cartwright's coat and said, ''General Jackson has come in.'' Cartwright states that he felt a wave of indignation run over him, then he replied in an audible voice, ''Who is General Jackson? If he don't get his soul converted, God will damn him as quick as he would a Guinea negro!''[6] This was certainly Jacksonian democracy.

Local preachers began early to organize Methodist classes in Kentucky. In 1783 Francis Clark and John Durham, both lay preachers from Virginia, settled in Mercer county, and by the next year a number of local preachers had settled in the state and were at work organizing Methodist classes.[7] In 1782 the minutes record the sending of a circuit rider to the Yadkin circuit; the next year both Yadkin and Holston are among the number of circuits, and in 1784 the Redstone circuit, in the southwest corner of Pennsylvania, is added to the number. In 1786 the Yadkin circuit reported 426 white members and 11 colored, the Holston 250 white members, and the Redstone 523.[8] In this

[5] David Sherman, *History of the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal church* (New York, 1874), 181-185.

[6] *Autobiography of Peter Cartwright, the backwoods preacher* (New York, 1856), 192.

[7] Albion H. Redford, *History of Methodism in Kentucky* (Nashville, 1868), 1: 26.

[8] *Minutes of conferences*, 1: 26.

year the Kentucky circuit was organized with James Haw and Benjamin Ogden as circuit riders. These preachers were welcomed in Kentucky by several Methodist families which had recently come from Maryland and Virginia, and at the end of their first year on the new circuit reported ninety members.[9]

As the population in Kentucky, Tennessee, and along the Ohio increased, the number of circuits and circuit preachers grew likewise. Among the converts made in 1786, which was a year of revival in the western circuits, was Peter Massie, the first convert in Kentucky to become a circuit rider.[10] The minutes for 1789 record the following circuits in Tennessee: Holston, West New river, Greenbrier, and Botetourt; while in Kentucky were Lexington, Danville, and Cumberland; and along the upper Ohio were those of Redstone, Pittsburgh, and Ohio. In 1790 there were 1,373 white Methodists and 40 colored, in Tennessee, while in Kentucky there were 1,265 whites and 87 colored.

With the close of the Indian wars and the signing of the treaty of Greenville, the southern half of Ohio and a narrow strip in southeastern Indiana were opened up to settlement. Settlers, a considerable number of whom had been members of Methodist classes in the older states, began to move into these new grants from Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina. One of the pioneer preachers writes: "The Indian war having terminated the people began to scatter in every direction. New settlements were formed, and Ohio and Indiana began to settle rapidly, and the societies, many of them were broken up, and we had not preachers sufficient to follow the tide of emigration to their new settlements."[11] As a result of this situation there was a decrease of members in the circuits in Tennessee and Kentucky from 1795 to 1801.

The first circuit organized in Ohio was formed in 1798 by John Kobler, who had recently been appointed presiding elder of the Kentucky district. He crossed the Ohio, and preached

[9] Redford, *Methodism in Kentucky*, 1: 27-32.

[10] *Ibid.*, 102.

[11] "Autobiography of Rev. William Burke," in James B. Finley, *Sketches of western Methodism* (Cincinnati, 1854), 73. In 1797 there were 1,740 white members and 57 colored reported for the Kentucky district. In 1799 the membership had decreased to 1,672 white, though there was a gain of eight colored. *Minutes of conferences*, 1: 74, 86.

in the home of one of these Kentucky Methodists who had migrated to the north side of the river. The Miami circuit, as the new circuit was known, ran from the Ohio up the Little Miami and Mad rivers to where Dayton now stands, thence down the Big Miami to Cincinnati. In 1800 the settlements along the Scioto river were grouped together to form the second Ohio circuit, the Scioto.[12] It happened that the first governor of Ohio, Edward Tiffin, was a Methodist local preacher ordained by Bishop Asbury in 1792. He had come from Virginia to Chillicothe in 1796, in 1799 was elected territorial representative, and when Ohio became a state, he was chosen to be the first governor. His home was always open to Methodist preaching and was the stopping place of many a weary itinerant preacher.[13] By 1811 eleven circuits had been organized in Ohio, divided between two districts, the Miami and the Muskingum. The circuits in the Miami district were Cincinnati, Mad river and Xenia, Scioto, Deer creek, Pickaway, White Oak, Salt creek, Delaware, and Brush creek, besides two circuits in Indiana, the Lawrenceburg and White Water. The Muskingum district contained Fairfield, Marietta, Little Kanawha, Guyandott, Letart Falls, Knox, and Tuscarawas circuits.[14]

While the itinerant preachers were finding their way into the Ohio valley, other preachers, equally zealous, were penetrating into the southwest. Tobias Gibson was appointed a missionary to the southwest in 1798, and starting from the Cumberland settlements, he traveled on horseback some four or five hundred miles; then trading his horse for a canoe, he paddled to all the southwest settlements, preaching wherever he found hearers, finally making his way back to a conference in northern Tennessee in 1802.[15] In 1805 a Mississippi district was formed from four circuits, and manned by five circuit riders and one presiding elder. Among these circuit riders was Elisha Bowman, who was that year appointed to the Opelousas circuit. Soon after the purchase of Louisiana, when Bishop Asbury called for

[12] John M. Barker, *History of Ohio Methodism* (New York, 1898), 88, 92. Also Redford, *Methodism in Kentucky*, 1: 227.

[13] A sketch of Governor Tiffin may be found in Finley, *Sketches of western Methodism*, 260-287.

[14] *Minutes of conferences*, 1: 212.

[15] John F. Hurst, *History of Methodism* (New York, 1904), 4: 572, 573.

volunteers to carry the gospel into the new territory, Elisha Bowman offered to go. He rode on horseback to New Orleans, which, he states, he found dirty as a pigsty and in almost as bad condition morally. He went to the governor, who promised him that he could preach in the city hall, but when Sunday came the hall was locked against him. There were few Americans in the city, and most of them represented the dregs of society. He learned, however, of an American settlement some two hundred miles west and northwest, which he reached, traveling largely by boat, taking his horse on a platform supported by two canoes. This was the Opelousas country where he found settlements of Americans who knew "very little more about the nature of salvation than the untaught Indians," and he states that "some of them, after I had preached, asked me what I meant by the fall of man, and when it was that he fell."[16] By 1812 nine circuits, known as Wilkinson, Natchez, Claiborne, Amite, Rapids, Washataw, Attakapas, Tombigbee, and New Orleans, had been formed in the southwest.

The Methodists had a prominent part in the great revival which swept over the west between the years 1797 and 1805. It began on the Cumberland, in Kentucky, under the influence of a Presbyterian minister, James McGready. By 1800 the revival had grown to such proportions that it included in its sweep all the denominations on the frontier, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists.[17] During these meetings, also, there originated the camp meeting, which became thereafter a Methodist institution that was employed with great effectiveness. This remarkable revival more than doubled the membership in the Western conference and also greatly increased the number of both local and traveling preachers.

In the midst of this revival Methodist preaching was begun north of the Ohio, in what is now Indiana. In 1803 the rider on the Salt river circuit in Kentucky crossed the Ohio river and

[16] *Minutes of conferences*, 1: 139; William H. Milburn, *Lance, cross, and canoe; the flatboat, rifle, and plough in the valley of the Mississippi* (New York, 1892), 357-360.

[17] Catherine C. Cleveland, *Great revival in the west, 1797-1805* (Chicago, 1916), ch. 2, 3. Accounts of this revival from the Methodist standpoint may be found in the "Autobiography of Rev. William Burke," in Finley, *Sketches of western Methodism*, 77-79; Redford, *Methodism in Kentucky*, 1: 268-272.

preached in Clark's grant, probably following some of the migrating Kentucky Methodists. It was not, however, until 1806 that a complete circuit, which was known as the Silver creek circuit, was laid out in Indiana. In the same year John Sale, the presiding elder in Ohio, sent a young preacher into southeastern Indiana, along the White Water, and by 1811 there were five circuits, wholly or partly in Indiana: the White Water, Lawrenceburg, Silver creek, Vincennes, and Patoka.[18]

In 1803 Bishop Asbury sent Benjamin Young as a missionary into the Illinois country. He met with great difficulties. In getting into Kaskaskia his horse was stolen by the Kickapoo Indians, and when he finally reached the town he was very coldly received, even having to pay high rent for the hall in which he preached. He succeeded, however, in forming five classes among the various settlements and at the end of the year reported sixty-seven members. This new circuit included all the settlements from the mouth of the Kaskaskia to Wood river, in Madison county, Illinois. Another missionary, who was sent to "Missourie" in 1806, reported fifty-six members at the end of the first year. In 1811 the Illinois circuit had 411 members, and the Missouri, 172.[19]

Between 1788 and 1800 there were at least twelve conferences held west of the mountains. The first of these was in May, 1788, at a place in eastern Tennessee called Half Acres. Other conferences were held at Masterson's station in north central Kentucky in 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1795, and 1796; at Lewis's chapel near Masterson's in 1794, and at Bethel academy in Kentucky in 1797, 1799, and 1800. Bishop Asbury came to a number of these conferences, and as the earlier ones were held during the progress of the Indian wars, several times the bishop was escorted over the mountains by a guard of these western preachers armed for the purpose. He was in attendance at the first conference in 1788, and in 1790 he was once more in Tennessee, having crossed over from North Carolina. He speaks of swimming the horses across the Wautauga, and of the danger from the Indians. He found the "poor preachers indiffer-

[18] William W. Sweet, *Circuit-rider days in Indiana* (Indianapolis, 1916), 1-19.

[19] James Leaton, *History of Methodism in Illinois from 1793-1832* (Cincinnati, 1883), 34-37; *Minutes of conferences*, 1: 209.

ently clad, with emaciated bodies." In May of this same year, after returning to the east, he crossed again from Virginia to Kentucky, two Kentucky preachers, Peter Massie and John Clark, accompanying him to the foot of the mountains, where they were joined by eight others, their company finally numbering sixteen men and thirteen guns. Passing into Kentucky, they crossed the Kentucky river, going "over mountains, steep hills, deep rivers, and muddy creeks, and thick growth of reeds for miles together." He saw the graves of the slain, twenty-four in one camp. He held conference at Masterson's, "a very comfortable house and kind people." Here plans were laid for the establishment of Bethel academy, which was the first Methodist institution of learning west of the mountains, and £300 was obtained in subscriptions. In his trip to Kentucky in 1792, the bishop heard "so much about Indians, Convention, Treaty, killing and scalping" that his attention was drawn away from the affairs of the infant church in the wilderness, and after much alarm concerning depredations committed by the Indians, he finally returned to Virginia with a company of thirty travelers and a few warriors.[20] Eighteen such trips were made by Bishop Asbury between 1788 and the time of his death, 1816.

In 1792 the first serious schism in the Methodist church took place, headed by James O'Kelly, a prominent preacher east of the mountains, who objected to Bishop Asbury's supreme appointing power. Those who withdrew with O'Kelly called themselves Republican Methodists, and a number of adherents were won in Kentucky and Tennessee, but most of them finally united with the sect known as the New Lights, and the Republican Methodists as a denomination went out of existence.[21]

The earliest conferences in the west were more or less irregular, but beginning with the one held at Bethel academy in 1800 there was organized a regular conference known as the Western

[20] Asbury says of the conference of 1788: "Came to Half Acres and Keywoods where we held conference three days, and I preached each day. The weather was cold, the room without fire and otherwise uncomfortable, we nevertheless made out to keep our seats until we had finished the essential parts of our business." Francis Asbury, *Journal* (New York, 1821), 2: 32; see also *ibid.*, 74, 126, 127.

[21] Lee, *History of the Methodists,* 178-180; Nathan Bangs, *History of the Methodist Episcopal church* (New York, 1839), 1: 351-356; Cartwright, *Autobiography,* 32, 33.

conference, embracing all the territory west of the mountains. This conference continued for eleven years; then it was divided into the Ohio and the Tennessee conferences. The sessions were held in the fall, generally in the last part of September or early October. Bishop Asbury attended seven of the twelve sessions of this conference, while William McKendree presided at five. Five of the sessions were held in Kentucky, four in Tennessee, and three in Ohio. The first one in Ohio met in 1807 at Chillicothe, while the sessions of 1809 and 1811 met at Cincinnati.[22]

The men who were the first to ride these western circuits, and who founded the church in the wilderness, were a group of interesting, if not eminent men. At least they were remarkable for their devotion; no Jesuit missionary ever entered upon his labors with greater zeal than that of these pioneer preachers of the west. None of them, certainly, ever undertook the work of an itinerant for financial return. In 1792 the salary of all traveling preachers was fixed at sixty-four dollars, in 1800 it was raised to eighty dollars a year, but few of the western preachers ever collected even this small sum.[23] The minutes of the Western conference record each year the deficiencies of salaries, and the list for 1804 contains the names of thirty-four preachers whose salary was deficient, out of forty-six in the conference.[24] William Burke, the secretary of the conference during all of its history, was the first married man in the west to attempt to travel a circuit. Bishop Asbury discouraged marriage among the western preachers, knowing the increased hardships it would bring, especially to the preachers' wives, so for this reason many of the pioneer preachers ceased to "travel," as the work of the active ministry was called, after their marriage. Burke states that one winter he "had to use a borrowed blanket instead of a cloak or overcoat."[25]

Many of these men deserve more attention than can be given in so brief a paper. Next to Bishop Asbury in the leadership

[22] Manuscript minutes of the Western conference.

[23] Robert Emory, *History of the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal church* (New York, 1845), 237, 238.

[24] Manuscript minutes of the Western conference, 13, 14.

[25] "Autobiography of Rev. William Burke," in Finley, *Sketches of western Methodism*, 91. Also Sweet, *Circuit-rider days in Indiana*, 18.

of the western branch of the church stands William McKendree. Like many of the western preachers he was a native of Virginia. He became an itinerant in 1788, traveling on eastern circuits until 1800 when Bishop Asbury took him across the mountains and gave him charge of the whole Western conference. Here he remained for eight years, then returned to Baltimore to attend the General conference. An eloquent sermon preached by McKendree at this conference procured his election as bishop.[26] Among the most eloquent of these early preachers was Samuel Parker, a native of New Jersey, and a man of considerable education. He began to preach in 1800, became presiding elder of a number of the western districts, and died in 1819, having literally burned himself out in the work of the itinerant ministry. Others of these interesting men are Benjamin Lakin, John Sale, Learner Blackman, Peter Cartwright, James Axley, Francis Poythress, and John A. Grenade, a writer of frontier hymns.[27]

What did the circuit rider do for the west? It goes without saying that he brought the influences of Christianity to the people of the frontier, who in many cases would have been without such influences. He did not wait for the building of churches, or for the organization of congregations, before beginning his work. Indeed, the Methodists were slow in securing houses of worship; they depended upon the cabins of the settlers as

[26] William C. Larrabee, *Asbury and his coadjutors* (Cincinnati, 1853), 2: 207-230.

[27] Finley, *Sketches of western Methodism,* 202-214; Sweet, *Circuit-rider days in Indiana*; and a "Memorial sketch of the life of Samuel Parker," in *Minutes of conferences,* 1: 358, 359. Fairly satisfactory sketches of the lives of a number of these western preachers may be found in Finley, *Sketches of western Methodism.* John A. Grenade wrote many songs mostly for camp meeting use. An article in the *Methodist review* for 1859, pp. 401 413, by B. S. Fry, discusses "Early camp meeting song writers," and gives considerable space to the songs of John A. Grenade. His songs mostly have the theme, "divine mercy" or "saving grace," of which the following is a sample.

"Think of what your Savior bore,
In the gloomy garden,
Sweating blood at every pore,
To procure thy pardon;
See him stretched upon the wood,
Bleeding, grieving, crying;
Suffering all the wrath of God,
Groaning, gasping, dying."

preaching places long after the Baptists and Presbyterians had begun the erection of substantial buildings. Many times the Methodists borrowed the churches of other denominations for their conferences. They were, however, not only a religious and moral force on the frontier, but a great influence for law and order as well. The Wesleyan system of church government, established in America by Francis Asbury, was most thorough and efficient. Asbury, who was not so great a preacher as he was an organizer, always stood for obedience to the laws of the church. Order was his passion and the introduction of such an orderly system into a more or less disorderly community must have had far-reaching influence. The circuit rider upheld order in public worship to such an extent that he many times took the lead in preserving it. In 1806 at a camp meeting near Marietta a crowd of "rabble and rowdies," as Peter Cartwright called them, came on a Sunday morning, "armed with dirks, clubs, knives, and horsewhips, and swore they would break up the meeting." While Cartwright was preaching one of the rowdies stood up on one of the seats and began to talk and laugh. The preacher ordered him down, but with oaths he refused. The magistrates present were afraid to arrest the young man, so Cartwright took a hand in the matter. After a general scuffle, in which the friends of law and order backed the preachers, the roughs were put to flight, though not until some thirty of them had been captured, and on Monday nearly three hundred dollars in fines and costs were collected.[28] This was not an unusual circumstance, but is simply a typical case.

The circuit rider also stood for moderation in religious practices. It has been the general conception that the preachers desired to work up to a state of frenzy at every meeting and took especial delight in such strange exercises as the "jerks," the "barking exercise," trances, and visions, but this is a misconception. Peter Cartwright states that "there were many . . . strange and wild exercises into which the subjects of this revival fell; such, for instance, as . . . the running, jumping, barking exercise. The Methodist preachers generally

[28] A. Eddy, "Influence of Methodism on civilization and education in the west," in the *Methodist review* for 1857, pp. 280-296; Tipple, *Francis Asbury*, 241, 244; Cartwright, *Autobiography*, 90-92.

preached against this extravagant wildness. I did it uniformly in my ministrations and sometimes gave great offense."[29]

Another achievement of Methodism on the frontier was that it trained laymen in the art of public speaking, as perhaps nothing else was able to do. Since lay preaching and class leading naturally fell to the more talented members of the community, many men received training for general political and social leadership.

No other church was so well suited to minister to the wants of the immigrants. "It alone was so organized as to be able to follow step by step this moveable population, and to carry the Gospel even to the most distant cabin. It alone could be present whenever a grave was opened, or an infant was found in its cradle." The other sects moved toward the Mississippi as fast as any number of their adherents formed part of the emigration thither, but Methodism alone exercised a weighty influence upon the mixed crowd, and to it the mass of the western population owes its instruction and belief. Indeed one might well call it the church of the west.[30]

William W. Sweet

De Pauw University
Greencastle, Indiana

[29] Cartwright, *Autobiography*, 51.

[30] From an article first printed in the *Revue des deux mondes* by M. Cucheval-Clavigny; translated and republished under the title, "Peter Cartwright and preaching in the west," in the *Methodist review*, 54: 556-577; 55: 69-88.

FUR TRADING COMPANIES IN THE NORTHWEST, 1760-1816[1]

A new epoch in the history of the northwest fur trade began in the year 1760. As soon as the capitulation of Montreal had been signed, British merchants and traders flocked into the great lakes region, where they laid the foundations of a business organization, based upon the principle of freedom of trade, which supplanted the old French system of leased posts and monopolies. The period between 1760 and the outbreak of the revolution was one of beginnings, and the year 1775 found the English and Scotch merchants, who had entered the northwest by way of Montreal, firmly established in the peltry trade. The revolution was a blessing in disguise to these merchants. Just before the war traders from New York were beginning to challenge the supremacy of their northern rivals, but during the period of hostilities British garrisons controlled the upper country and the communications leading thereto, thus excluding the revolting colonies from practically any share in the commerce of the region of the great lakes and the upper Mississippi. The retention of the frontier posts by Great Britain until 1796, which made possible the rigid exclusion of Americans from the northwest, strengthened the monopoly which had been built up during the revolution, and the merchants of Montreal were able to maintain their position within the territory of the United States until after the war of 1812. During this period the traffic in furs was exploited to a very large degree by trading companies, and it is the purpose of this paper to outline the history of these companies and to trace the steps by which American enterprise supplanted British influence within the limits of the United States.

The causes which led to the centralization of the fur trade in the hands of large companies depended to a very considerable

[1] The author had expected to supply from his notes references to the sources upon which this paper is based, but his entrance into the army made that impossible. He has therefore consented to allow it to be printed without references. — Ed.

degree upon the general conditions under which the industry was carried on. During the period of British influence, as during the days of the old French régime, the northwest peltry trade occupied three fairly distinct areas. Detroit was the center of the commerce of the region between the great lakes and the Ohio river, including a part of the lower peninsula of Michigan. Michillimackinac was the *entrepôt* for the trade of the broad valley of the upper Mississippi and its tributaries, together with the region south of lake Superior. The vast territory stretching north and westward beyond lake Superior constituted a third area, for which a post at Grand Portage served as the general rendezvous. Montreal was the great emporium for the trade of the entire northwest, and it was literally true that all roads, or waterways, to be more accurate, led to Montreal.

The tremendous distances which goods and furs must be carried rendered it physically impossible for a single individual efficiently to supervise the trade in all its stages from the Montreal warehouse to the wilderness post and led to the development of a sort of commercial hierarchy. At the top were the great Montreal firms which imported goods from England on commission and forwarded them to their customers at the upper posts. At Detroit and Michillimackinac were many smaller merchants who made up into outfits the goods imported from Montreal, selling them in turn to the wilderness traders who followed the Indians to their hunting grounds, or trading them on their own account through the medium of hired clerks. The furs carried in from the hunting grounds might be disposed of to the merchants or outfitters in the upper country, or they might be sent to Montreal, or even to England, to be sold on account.

The profitable exploitation of the industry depended upon the elimination of cut-throat competition, always the bane of the fur trade, the amenities of which, in one instance, are revealed in the words of Alexander Mackenzie, in an account of an early struggle with the North-west company: "After the severest struggle ever known in that part of the world, and suffering every oppression which a jealous and rival spirit could instigate; after the murder of one of our partners, the laming of

another, and the narrow escape of one of our clerks, who received a bullet through his powder horn in the execution of his duty, they were compelled to allow us a share of the trade." The character of the fur trade, the great distances involved, and the length of time which must elapse before any return could be secured on the goods imported from England, rendered some form of business coöperation most desirable. The organization of the industry, moreover, would tend to do away with the lawless conditions which were only too apt to prevail in the interior under the régime of the private trader. These were the causes leading to the formation of the companies which arose during the period following the revolution.

This need for some sort of organization led early to the formation of certain companies or associations of merchants at Detroit and Michillimackinac during the revolution and the years immediately following. In 1779, the merchants of Michillimackinac pooled their interests in a kind of partnership which they called a general store. The agreement was of a temporary nature, however, and the association came to an end without having any permanent influence upon the trade of the region. Shortly after the close of the revolution there was a tremendous increase in the quantity of goods for the Indian trade sent into the upper country by way of Montreal. Competition increased by leaps and bounds and it was soon evident to the merchants at the upper posts that a remedy must be found. With the idea of limiting the quantity of goods sent to the interior, a number of merchants with headquarters at Michillimackinac formed a partnership in 1785 called the General company of lake Superior and the south, or more briefly referred to as the General society. The agreement was for a period of three years and the operations of the company were extended over a wide range of territory in the upper country from lake Superior southward to the Illinois country, and from lake Michigan westward to the headwaters of the Missouri river, in the Spanish territory of Louisiana. The concern appears to have broken up about 1787, however, before the expiration of the period of agreement, and there is no evidence of any further attempt to organize the trade of the region dependent upon Michillimackinac until 1806. The demoralization of the com-

merce of the country dependent upon Detroit, owing to ruinous competition and the unrest among the Indian tribes northwest of the Ohio, led to the organization, in 1786 or thereabouts, by six Detroit firms of a similar partnership called the Miami company. Little is known about the history of this concern beyond the fact that it was still in existence in 1789. The period from 1760 to 1816 was marked by a decline in the trade of the region dependent upon Detroit, for the settler's frontier was beginning to encroach upon the trader's wilderness.

The trade of the British merchants attained its highest development in the region occupied by the North-west company, an organization which dominated the trade of the Canadian northwest from the close of the American revolution until its union with the Hudson's bay company in 1819. The origins of the company must be sought in the activities of Alexander Henry, Peter Pond, the Frobisher brothers, and other doughty traders who penetrated the region beyond lake Superior during the years which followed the conquest of Canada. Various attempts at coöperation on the part of the Canadian merchants trading to the northwest prior to the close of the revolution were followed in the winter of 1783-1784 by the formation of a sixteen-share company at Montreal. Frequent reorganizations of the company followed, new partners being admitted from time to time, and when the agreement of 1804 was drawn up, the number of shares had been increased to one hundred.

The manner in which the North-west company conducted its business is of considerable interest and importance, inasmuch as it served as a prototype for other similar organizations. Certain of the firms whose members were interested in the concern were located at Montreal and had charge of the importation of the goods which were traded by the company and also disposed of the furs which were sent down from the upper country. Certain members of these firms were selected to supervise the transportation of the outfits along the water communications, and attend to the securing of provisions and supplies. A large number of the shareholders located in the upper country were called wintering partners. They attended personally to the trade of the interior and directed the operations of the clerks and *engagés* of the concern. The North-west company con-

ducted all its own business through the various stages, importing goods from England through its agents at Montreal, and dividing the net profits among the partners in proportion to their respective shares. The general policy of the company was determined at the annual meeting of the partners at Grand Portage.

The organization prospered greatly and gradually absorbed all its rivals. A period of ruinous competition, which began in 1798 with the establishment of the New North-west, or X Y company, as it was often called, was terminated by the union of the two companies under the northwest agreement of 1804. At this time the territory controlled by the North-west company included the wilderness beyond lake Superior and also a considerable extent of territory within the United States. Its *bourgeois* and clerks were stationed in the departments of Red lake and Fond du Lac in Minnesota, upon the Chippewa river and Lac du Flambeau in northern Wisconsin, at Chequamegon in the upper peninsula of Michigan, upon Rainy lake, along the boundary between the United States and Canada, and upon the upper reaches of the Red river.

Prior to 1806, commerce of the region to the south of the territory controlled by the North-west company was practically unorganized. After the General society at Michillimackinac had come to an end about 1787, the trade of the country depending upon that post was in the hands of small individual firms, and the frequent references of secondary writers to a Mackinac company supposed to have been in existence before 1806 are incorrect. Shortly after the union of the North-west and X Y companies in 1804, however, a project was formed to organize the trade of the upper Mississippi valley by establishing a company similar to the one which had been so successful in the northwest. The result was that, in 1806, articles of agreement were drawn up at Montreal which were to serve as the basis of a new fur-trading concern, the Michillimackinac, or Mackinac company.

Its form of organization indicates that the new enterprise was modeled upon the North-west company. The general conduct of the business at Montreal was in the hands of Forsyth, Richardson, and company; McTavish, McGillivray, and company;

James and Andrew McGill and company; and Parker, Gerrard, Ogilvie, and company. A number of merchants and small trading firms with headquarters at Michillimackinac put a certain amount of goods in the stock of the concern, in return for which they received shares and were known as wintering partners. The resemblance to the organization of the North-west company is obvious and the reason is not far to seek. Both Forsyth, Richardson, and company, and McTavish, McGillivray, and company were influential shareholders in the older company, and it was only natural that they should organize the new concern along lines with which they were familiar.

There was a complete understanding between the Michillimackinac and North-west companies, and the same day the articles of agreement establishing the former were drawn up, an arrangement was made between the two, whereby each was assigned a particular sphere of influence. The North-west company agreed to abandon its posts in the interior of northern Wisconsin, together with those on the south side of lake Superior between the Sault Ste. Marie and Chequamegon, while retaining the posts between Chequamegon and the western end of lake Superior. The boundary as further described in the articles of agreement was to run due westward from lake Superior to the point where the Sheyenne empties into the Red river. In view of this arrangement, the Michillimackinac and North-west companies are in no sense to be regarded as rivals.

If all had gone well, the partners of the Michillimackinac company might have equaled the success of the North-westers, but their plans seemed foredoomed to failure. In the first place, the new company had been formed during a period of strained relations between England and the United States. The Canadian merchants trading from Montreal to the upper country complained frequently that excessive duties were collected by United States customs officers, and they likewise lived in continual dread of the effect which the Non-importation and Embargo acts might have upon their trade. In 1810 they complained that the Non-intercourse act prevented them from carrying their goods into the territory of the United States and bringing away their furs. The Jay treaty had stipulated that British fur traders should be free to operate within the United

States, but in 1805, General Wilkinson of the Louisiana territory issued a proclamation excluding foreign traders from the Missouri river, on the ground that the provisions of the treaty did not apply to territory acquired in 1803. The attempt to enforce this restriction aroused grave apprehension among the partners of the Michillimackinac company, some of whom believed that if the concern were obliged to confine its activities to the country east of the Mississippi, it might as well cease operations. In 1796, the United States had adopted a plan for the establishment of government trading factories, primarily for the purpose of winning the Indians away from British influence. By 1808 there were government houses at Mackinac, Chicago, Fort Madison, and Fort Osage, which were gaining a considerable share of the commerce previously monopolized by British traders operating from Michillimackinac. American competition was threatening from another quarter also, for in 1808, John Jacob Astor, who had been engaged in the fur trade for several years and was thoroughly familiar with the business methods of the merchants of Montreal, organized the American fur company and at once planned to develop the industry upon an unprecedented scale.

Within three years of the time when the Michillimackinac company was founded, it had become apparent to the wintering partners and to the shareholders at Montreal that the enterprise was a failure. Early in 1810, John Richardson and William McGillivray went to New York to treat with Astor concerning the possibility of selling the interests of the Michillimackinac enterprise to the American fur company. Exactly what arrangements they made with Astor it is impossible to say, but from the subsequent course of events it is possible to infer what took place. In 1810, the Michillimackinac company was dissolved, in the manner prescribed by the original articles of agreement, and Forsyth, Richardson, and company, and McTavish, McGillivray, and company, two of the firms interested therein, formed a new concern called the Montreal-Michillimackinac company. On January 8, 1811, an agreement was drawn up which brought about a merger between this new concern and the American fur company. To this merger was given the name of the South-west company.

The character of the partnership thus formed is of considerable interest and has been quite generally misunderstood. Astor did not, as has often been stated, buy out the Michillimackinac company. The organization was dissolved and was superseded by the Montreal-Michillimackinac company, a portion of the goods of the original concern being purchased by the latter, while a portion was taken over by the American fur company. The articles of agreement by which the South-west company was formed were to continue in force for a period of five years. Half the goods used in the trade were to be supplied by the American fur company and were to be imported by way of New York, while the other half were to be supplied by the Montreal partners, and to be imported by way of Quebec. The proceeds of the trade were to be divided equally between the two companies. Inasmuch as Forsyth, Richardson, and company, and McTavish, McGillivray, and company were two of the leading shareholders in the North-west company, they were able to make certain stipulations and concessions on its behalf in drawing up the articles of agreement with Astor. The American fur company was to confine its activities to the limits of the United States, with the exception of certain Canadian territory near lake Huron not exploited by the North-west company. In return the North-west company agreed to give up all trade with the Indians south of the United States boundary. It is significant, however, that these provisions were not to apply to "any County beyond the Ridge of the Rocky Mountains, nor the River Missourie nor the North West Coast or the Pacific Ocean." That the United States government factories had by this time gained a considerable share of the trade of the northwest is apparent from the fact that the articles of agreement provided that if the government trading houses should be abolished, two-thirds of the business of the South-west company, instead of one half, should be under the direction of the American fur company. It was evidently assumed that the removal of the factories might be expected to increase the business of the whole concern by about one half.

Time does not permit of any account of the operations of the South-west company during the following years. It extended its commerce over the same territory which had been exploited

by the Michillimackinac company and appears to have employed similar business methods. The war of 1812 disorganized the fur trade to a very considerable extent and led indirectly to the dissolution of the South-west company. Ever since the frontier posts had been surrendered in 1796, the feeling had prevailed in the United States that British traders operating in American territory were exerting a dangerous political influence over the Indians, a feeling which was accentuated by the war of 1812. The treaty of Ghent contained no stipulation with regard to the Indian trade, so in April of 1816, Congress seized the opportunity to enact a law which prohibited foreigners from carrying on the fur trade within the United States.

It has been asserted that Astor was instrumental in securing the enactment of this law; at any rate, he lost no time in going to Montreal, where he made arrangements with Forsyth, Richardson, and company, and McTavish, McGillivray, and company, for the purchase of their interests in the South-west company. The withdrawal of these Montreal firms marks the final disappearance of the British commercial influence which had been such an important factor in the history of the great lakes and upper Mississippi region since the conquest of Canada. Henceforth, until the industry itself disappeared, the fur trade of this territory was controlled by Americans, who employed, however, the same business methods which had been developed under the British régime.

In the foregoing discussion, an effort has been made to sketch in briefest outline the development of the great British trading companies in the northwest and to indicate certain phases of their history which have hitherto remained obscure, notably the origin of the Michillimackinac company and the nature of its connection with the American fur company. Another twenty minutes might easily be given to a bare enumeration of certain problems which have presented themselves during the preparation of this sketch, for to anyone who has made any investigation in this field of study, it is apparent that the history of the northwest fur trade is yet to be written.

Wayne E. Stevens

Camp Cody
Deming, New Mexico

LATIN-AMERICAN HISTORY AS A FIELD OF STUDY FOR MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STUDENTS

In the colleges in all parts of our country certain courses in history are offered which deal with what might be called standardized fields, such as ancient, English, modern, European, and American history, with their various subdivisions. Then there are what may be termed local interest courses, which differ in various parts of the country. Among these are courses in state history, and others of a more or less local nature. The Mississippi valley naturally is interested in its own history, and such work as most of our teachers of history in this region give in addition to that along well-established lines usually deals with some phase or phases of the development of this great river valley. Such study is right, natural, and proper. There are some fields, however, that, while not standardized as fields for history courses and while not in or of the Mississippi valley, have yet so much of especial interest to us who live in this valley as to justify courses dealing with them. I refer to such fields as that of the history of Canada — particularly of the western part where the settlement has been so similar to and yet so different from that of our middle west — of the history of the northwest, of the southwest, of the south as a whole, and of the Latin-American countries. All these touch our interests at certain points, but it is of the latter that I wish to treat.

From some points of view the historical connection between southwestern United States and the Latin-American countries is a close one. The beginnings of the history of that region, after its discovery by the Spaniards, are rather intimately related to the earliest recorded history of our Mississippi valley. Recall how Pineda, when exploring the Gulf coast in 1519, and going westward from Ponce de León's Florida coast, was the first to map the southern boundary of our valley, and, indeed, was the first white man to set eyes upon any nook or corner of this vast and fair interior region — surely an event of some

interest in our history. Moreover his expedition, together with that of Grijalva, who had been searching eagerly but in vain for the long-desired passage through the land barrier and, in 1518, had been mapping the coast-line from Yucatan northward, closed the gap in that unknown coast-line. Thus there was traced at practically the same time and as part of the same general exploring movement the Atlantic coast-line of the northern part of Latin America and the southern boundary of our valley.

The ill-fated expedition of Nárvaez in 1528 put another seal on the Spanish title to our region. A few years later, in 1542, it was one of the fearless, dare-devil leaders developed by the Spanish colonial life in Española who, after making a fortune as a gentleman adventurer in the typical business of gold-washing and stock-raising in that island colony, decided to seek new fields of adventure and so to enjoy spending some of his riches — on the chance of finding new and greater wealth. The result of this decision was the well-equipped expedition of Fernando de Soto, which, hindered and delayed by almost incredible hardships due to forests, fevers, and Indians, came slowly but determinedly toward the Father of waters. Slashing, hacking, or cajoling its way it crept along until finally it discovered and crossed the mighty center and cause of our valley, the Mississippi. To the westward, at the same time, Coronado's party was exploring the southwestern part of this same region. For a century and a half this territory, if it belonged to any European power, was a part of Spanish America. Not until La Salle made his voyage in 1682 could any nation or government, on the basis of having explored any part of it, successfully challenge the title of Spain to this land. The accident that Spanish administrators were so busy in their greedy quest for wealth in the West Indies, Mexico, and Peru that they did not more thoroughly explore and occupy the territory does not alter the fact that the first emblem of civilized government that had a right to be set up in the Mississippi valley was the standard of Spain — the standard of most of Latin America for three hundred years — and that right continued for over a century and a half, a longer period of time than the stars and stripes have as yet had the right to fly here.

Spanish influence in and upon this region during the eighteenth century and in the early part of the nineteenth is a far from negligible element in the history of the United States. Spanish influence in the west during our revolution was the theme of an important contribution made by Professor James at the last meeting of the American historical association. The early Spanish settlements along the Mississippi had a strong influence upon the character and amount of the early river trading. Spanish ownership of Louisiana had a lasting effect; as far north as Iowa Spanish law has had to be administered in our courts in connection with land titles. There were various commercial and boundary troubles with the Spanish during the administrations of Washington and Adams, and indeed even until the treaty of 1819. The liberty-loving spirit of the middle west applauded the struggle of the Spanish colonies to win their freedom, and Henry Clay, the first Pan-American, was a true representative of his constituents in that respect. In fact Spain and Spanish America were so intimately bound up with a great part of our western life during that period that the study of Latin-American history cannot rightfully be left out. Thus the historical connections are both interesting and significant.

It is not the historical connection between the Mississippi valley and Latin America, however, which kindles the chief interest of the student of one region in the other, or which chiefly justifies such study and interest. It is rather the general, and in some respects striking, similarity of the economic and industrial development and problems of the two regions throughout their history. In this respect it is undoubtedly the eastern, the agricultural and pastoral part of South America, that is of greatest interest to us. That great and mighty river, the Paraná, swinging southward bears a striking resemblance to the Mississippi. Moreover it has created a remarkably similar life and activity in its drainage basin. The great stretches of prairie land used in time for grazing great herds, the period of the cowboy (called in South America the Gaucho), picturesque and at times wild, but teeming with virility; the gradually developing river traffic as villages became towns, and towns grew to cities on its banks; the railway development which, as it

brought in settlers, changed the industrial situation of the region; the cutting down of the great ranches and the forcing out of existence of the cowboy; the startling rapidity of all this development; and, finally, the establishment of a varied agricultural and industrial life, which grew and continues to grow ever more intricate with the increasing population — all these experiences belong to Argentine and Uruguay in common with the Mississippi valley. There is no other place on the earth's surface where as many economic problems are so similar to those in our middle west as the valley of the Paraná. The topography of the country, its climatic conditions, the character of the grain crops, the meat and timber industries, the problems of transportation over long distances of comparatively level land, the growth of large cities dependent upon these very industries — all these problems and others are almost precisely the same as those encountered by the people of the Mississippi valley. The one strikingly dissimilar element is the social one: the people are different. That one different element in the situation gives a keen edge to the study of their industrial, political, and economic problems by one who has in the background of his mind the history of these same problems as they were met and solved by the people of the Mississippi valley.

The interest of our students in the west coast of South America is entirely natural, growing out of the probably increasingly intimate commercial relations, for the Panama canal is a direct connecting link between the Mississippi valley and the ports of Chile, Peru, and Ecuador. Another reason, perhaps, for our interest in the west coast is that much of our capital and many of our young engineers are at work there, and the influences of both are bound to increase, probably rapidly, in the future.

Among the increasing number of young men from our colleges and universities who are going into commercial life there is a growing interest in Latin America. More of them study the Spanish language each year. Their interest is being fed and stimulated in many ways, among others by government literature. Among the titles of recent publications issued by the government are "Banking opportunities in South America,"

"Tariff systems of the South American countries," "Practical Pan-Americanism," "Financial developments in South America," "A glance at Latin-American civilization," "Plants from Colombia and Central America," and "Secondary schools in Central America." A wide and legitimate interest is being aroused largely along business lines, but not wholly so, and we owe it to the alert young manhood of our section of the country to provide an opportunity in our colleges and universities for them to study the history and the present conditions of these continental neighbors of ours, the "other Americans." Such study is natural, cultural, and practical; it is truly educational and deserves to be a part of our serious instructional courses in history and economics; perhaps, also, of our research work, although that is not the work I am just now most interested in urging upon your attention.

No longer can it be said, as it could have been charged a few years ago, that "there is not material available for such a course." It is true there is no adequate text-book, but this is a field preëminently suited to the lecture method and not to a text-book study. The lecturer must, of course, be able to handle Spanish as well as French and German, for much valuable material is printed in these languages. Moreover he must read Portuguese if he attempts to deal intensively with Brazilian history. But for most class assignments, of course, English materials must be used, for although we usually have individual students who can use Spanish as a tool we seldom have a class to which other than English assignments can be made — at least such is my experience.

One who has not come into touch with this field is almost invariably surprised at the amount of material printed in English, part of it written by Englishmen, part by Americans, and some translated from the Spanish, French, and German. Without making or trying to make anything like a complete list may I run over the names of some of the writers whose work has been a contribution of value for use in a general course on Latin America? First, there are several old standard writers whose work has much of value and cannot be neglected, such as H. H. Bancroft, Prescott, Justin Winsor, and, a little later, Deberle (translated from the French), Arthur Hinds, and Akers.

Of the group of writers who have published careful and helpful studies on definite fields we have Moses, William Roscher, Bingham, Paxson, Robertson, Reinsch, Chapman, Don M. Smith, Richman, Jones, Martinez, Mozans, Sir Clements R. Markham, Martin Hume, and Percy F. Martin. Among the general works of a stimulating and helpful nature are those by James Bryce, Ross, Clémenceau, Shepherd, Garcia-Calderón, Dawson, Porter, Enock, Domville-Fife, Hale, and Rafael Reyes. Then there are many works of purely descriptive character, books of travel, of mountain climbing, and of missionary journeys, which must be assigned with discrimination, but some of which are very illuminating and helpful. Added to these are the files of the Pan-American union, the annual *South American year book,* the hand books of the various countries, Stanford's *Compendium,* Babson's reports, a mass of consular, governmental, and Pan-American reports, the *Clark university addresses* of 1913, and, finally, the reports of various congresses such as the Second Pan-American scientific congress of 1915 and the Panama congress of religions of 1916. All these are easily available in English.[1] Thus there is a rapidly growing literature on the subject, adequate for the students' reading and study, though of course unorganized. Material is available in English for as difficult a course as one may wish to conduct.

What will probably prove to be a valuable aid in the future is the journal dealing with Latin-American history and conditions which will probably be started soon, and for which a committee of the American historical association headed by Dr. James A. Robertson is now gathering a guaranty fund. This journal, according to tentative plans now made, will contain not only historical contributions from scholars in the two Americas, but a variety of notes, comments, and information intended to help us know the Latin-American countries of today. It will aim to engender sympathy and understanding and thus promote in the Americas the feeling of internationalism. "It will effect its purpose by establishing an 'entente cordiale' among the scholars (big and little) of the different countries." Thus

[1] I am making no reference to the large number of Spanish sources of information that are available, most of them not quite so easily obtainable it is true, but still entirely possible of being secured.

it will undoubtedly prove a useful and helpful tool for students in this field.

In connection with the course which I have been giving in Grinnell for some six years I have found that there are in this field many topics and problems which lend themselves readily and easily to graphic work. My students have seemed to find genuine pleasure, and have done much real work, in putting the results of their individual studies or class reports into the form of charts. I stipulate each time at the beginning of the course that these charts are to be a contribution to the permanent library of this course, and thus I have a rather large collection of charts dealing with comparative conditions in countries or in parts of countries regarding problems of education, population, immigration, missions, industries, natural resources, railways, and a variety of historical subjects. These obviously serve two purposes. The student knowing that his work on these charts must bear his name and knowing also that they are to be preserved as parts of the collection in a large case built especially for them and are to be used by succeeding students in the subject, spurs himself to put into the charts the best work of which he is capable. It gives him excellent training in the selection of sources. Some of the charts are exceedingly well done and are valuable aids to classes. Secondly, as time goes on, by turning to my case and selecting from it the proper charts I have graphic proof or representation of almost any development or tendency at the time under class discussion. We therefore have a growing accumulation of at least semi-original material in this form.

Interest in the course seems to be keen, doubtless owing largely to the fact that it is full of what is to the student novel and picturesque material, from the time of the study of those wonderful cultures known as the Inca, Maya, Quichua, and Aztec, through the period of the forceful, cruel, domineering, yet brave and attractive, *conquistadores,* into the study of the details of the great Spanish colonial system, through the heroically fought wars of independence, and into the varied history of the present-day nations. Without exception there is astonishment at the strides many of these nations have taken,

and there is developed in the minds of the students a profound respect for them, together with a sympathetic understanding of many of their problems. I have seen students broaden in their interests and in the scope of their understanding while working in this course. Incidentally, in connection with such a course as this, it is necessary to give the student a good stiff dose of Spanish and Portuguese history as it developed in the peninsula, in order that he may have the right perspective of that history in the Americas. Otherwise he can hardly understand the large measure of power residing in the local municipalities in the colonies, the development of the Inquisition in America, the institution of the "audiencia," and many other of the important elements of that history.

There is a wide field from which such study will draw aside from the definite advantages thus far noted. It will put one into touch with the wholesome and progressive spirit of Pan-Americanism. It will enlarge our sympathies as well as our knowledge; and as citizens of a great republic it should be a source of pride to us, as well as a definite aim on our part, to learn of the ideals, hopes, and accomplishments of other republics in order to fully appreciate them, for the rule that a man cannot truly appreciate another until he knows him applies as well to a people or a nation. Moreover, because of the increasingly important place that many of the Latin-American states are coming to take as contributors to and sharers in the world relations, economic, political, and literary, no educated man of the next generation can afford to be ignorant of Latin-American conditions if he would make any pretense whatever at being a well-informed person.

We of this middle west region, then, should desire to give to the students in our history departments full opportunity of becoming acquainted with this field, so that they may understand the extent and causes of the progress of Latin America, the type and meaning of its civilization. Are there any reasons why Mississippi valley students and scholars should not be interested in Latin-American history? If so, I do not know them. This phase of history deals with a region that lies a neighbor, almost next door to the Mississippi valley; courses

in it can be easily made practical, interesting, and educationally profitable. Thus it is that I would urge that at least a one-year, general, elective course on the history of Latin America be made a part of the usual curriculum of our colleges and universities.

Paul F. Peck

Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa

PAGEANTRY POSSIBILITIES

It will be my endeavor today to tell you something of those phases of pageantry which have to do with organization, mechanism, and practicability. The purpose and value of pageantry I shall neglect, knowing that you are well acquainted with the peculiar beauty, the sustained inspiration, and the patriotic power that characterize this form of outdoor drama. In giving my talk I shall take the liberty of referring, from time to time, to my own experiences with recent pageants given during the Indiana centenary. When I have finished, I hope you will have received some useful hints about the writing and producing of pageants.

The most important feature of pageants, briefly stated, is their accessibility. If you really want a pageant you can have one; it is within the reach of all, regardless of the size and means of the community. A pageant, in its completed state, appears to be a tremendous and costly spectacle. It can be made so, yet its success does not depend on magnitude or costliness, for it is a plastic medium of inspiration that can be produced by any community and amplified or modified to suit local conditions. No one need feel that a pageant is beyond his power. If you want one intensely enough, you can make one by yourself. If your whole community will not help you, perhaps half of it will; if one hundred people refuse to act, five, three, or one of you can. All that you need is determination, courage, and spirit; then a group of friends and citizens who will act as players, willing to do your bidding.

Two things seem to be essential for a successful pageant: a genuinely patriotic spirit and a scenario that has a unifying idea, capable of dominating the entire pageant. This last is most necessary from the dramatic standpoint, for without it the pageant is formless, inconsequential, and even incapable of holding the attention of the audience. Such a unifying idea, however, need not be pretentious or intricate. If the pageant has to do with the growth and development of a state, unity may

be secured easily and practically by the arrangement of the events of the pageant itself, by means of a broad observance of historical continuity. The early episodes, for instance, can be made to relate to the frontier period, later ones to civil war times, and concluding events to the present. Perhaps the pageant will have to do with the history of education in the state. Here, again, historical order may accompany the order of the episodes. First come the schools of colonial days; then, perhaps, the period of the log cabin and the little red school house; finally, the modern school and high school days, the college and the university. Unconsciously, the audience will compare and contrast conditions, and thus, through just such a simple device, the growth in educational systems and methods is made apparent. The impression of unity is heightened, furthermore, by the introduction of a central group of historical or symbolical characters who go through the entire pageant, pointing out their particular relation to the episodes and scenes. The audience, in imagination, follows these characters through their experiences, just as it would follow the characters in a play or a guide who is pointing out a new country. In a recent pageant this plan was followed out by the introduction of two symbolical characters, History and Education, accompanied by a group of historical personages. Education comes forth, accompanied by a group consisting of the great teachers of all ages — Socrates, Aristotle, Calvin, Froebel, and Horace Mann. Then Education meets Columbia, who is, in turn, accompanied by the Sister States. Columbia calls forth Indiana from the group of Sister States and asks her to show Education the work that she has done along educational lines, during the century that has passed. Indiana responds to this request by displaying the various events of the pageant to the assembled company. The events, of course, treat matters of educational interest. At the conclusion of the pageant, Education, in pantomime, congratulates Indiana on her accomplishments and crowns her with the laurel. By placing such symbolic figures as these in the foreground, unity of impression is effected, a thread of plot developed, and a resultant continuity of interest attained. Similarly, in another pageant, the State Indiana herself, accompanied by a group of girls representing the counties, meets on the university campus

Father Time, accompanied by Day, Night, and the Hours. Indiana begs Time to linger a moment with his companions in order that he may survey the beauties of the place and learn its history. Time refuses, but permits the Hours to remain. They do so gladly and immediately perform the dance of the Hours. Then the State invokes, by means of a magic fire, the spirits of the past and of the place and the events that concerned them. Then there appear, in historical order, the various incidents and personages of the pageant itself. When all these have been displayed the pageant proper is over. The Hours perform a dance of praise and homage, then disappear into the distance, whereupon Indiana and the Counties solemnly depart.

These descriptions illustrate how unity of impression is secured through the historical continuity of the pageant and through the introduction of symbolical characters who accompany the episodes and point out their meaning.

There is still another way to create the impression of unity. That is through the costumes, the costumes worn by the principal characters and the costumes worn by the various groups. Such groups and characters, dressed according to a certain definite color scheme and a particular design and remaining constantly before the spectators, are bound to create a permanent and unified impression. The music, too, can be made by means of motifs, themes, trumpet calls, and descriptive passages, to have the same effect. Band music, by the way, is preferable to any other kind, as it has more volume and carries better in the open. The music should be continuous, as in the opera, for it can obscure many an awkward gap and the impending monotonous wait.

The plot of the pageant should be simple, the main outline plastic and adaptable to interpolation. Detail and intricacy in the main theme are impractical and useless, for a tremendous audience cannot, from a distance, follow intrigue and counterplot. A few simply drawn characters, typical of some definite purpose and allied to the various episodes, can give a peculiar sort of interest that answers for pure plot interest. An audience derives much pleasure from seeing Abraham Lincoln or some other famous impersonated character walking about naturally in the world of today.

After the main outlines of the pageant have been constructed individual episodes may be considered. Here great variety is both possible and desirable. There may be action, change, scenes from plays or books by local authors, tableaux, exhibitions, feats of dexterity, drills, and dances. A single character may hold the stage, or ten thousand may participate in a spectacular flag drill. Even humor and pathos may be introduced in a domestic scene of early days, or in the larks of school children playing in the school yard.

To illustrate ways and means in pageantry, I will hastily run through a program that could be produced on a large or small scale. For convenience, I will say that the pageant is for the city of Chicago, because this city and her achievements are so well known to all. I will merely sketch in the incidents and rely on historical continuity to create unity of impression.

The first episode shows the early history of Chicago. It is a scene from Indian life, with wigwams, campfires, hunters, squaws, horses, dogs, and war dances. The early explorers arrive; in proper order and in characteristic scenes, appear Joliet and Marquette, La Salle, Hennepin, Tonty, and their associates. They study the place and make plans. Next to appear is Jean Baptiste Point de Sable, who builds a log cabin for himself; then Le Mai, the fur trader, who talks with De Sable and decides to buy his home. Following him comes John Kinzie, the first white settler. He also barters for this cabin home, gets it, and makes it his dwelling place. The scene closes with the subsequent arrival of homesteaders, pioneers, and traders who set about building their houses, providing for their wants, and making plans for the town. They begin, also, to lay out the streets and start the foundations for the first public structure over which they place a banner, bearing the words "Esray Pen."

An episode of this sort dealing with early conditions, forms an excellent introduction for the typical pageant. It may be either simple or elaborate, enacted easily by twenty or thirty people in appropriate costumes, or by several hundreds, elaborately dressed as Indians and settlers, who engage in a great fight with involved maneuvers and a victorious climax.

The second episode is composed of a series of historical tableaux in chronological order. The first one depicts the formal

founding of the town in 1830, while the others show the incorporation of the city in 1833, the completion of the Illinois and Michigan canal, and the chartering of the city in 1837. All these tableaux show respectively the prominent men of the time, the costumes of the period, and the appropriate backgrounds. A simple substitute for this episode is supplied by the appearance of a single historical personage, surrounded by and directing a group of workmen, citizens, or dignitaries, who are shown in some act that concerns these momentous events.

If one episode is static, the next should show motion; therefore the fourth episode is a dance, symbolical of the Chicago fire. One group of dancers represents the old city, another the flames and the smoke, while figures appearing later personify Desolation and Hunger. These are quickly overthrown, however, by another group typifying Hope, Ambition, Good Fortune, Success, and the New City.

The fifth episode is especially interesting and varied, as it shows the World's fair with groups of characters representing the different nations, with displays, exhibitions, drills, scenic effects, and novelties.

The final episode has to do with the spirit of the new Chicago. Here the meaning of the seal of Chicago is explained by groups of characters who are dressed to portray the features of the seal and who carry appropriate banners. All the activities of the modern city are shown: art, music, commerce. The close of the pageant should be elaborate and designed to leave a lasting impression. The cumulative inspiration of the preceding scenes is here heightened by means of numbers, music, and color, primarily the color of flags and banners. When possible, it is highly desirable that the pageant begin in the afternoon and last until the "edge of dark," the dusk, so that the definite lines may become softened and shadowy, and the commonplace may become poetic. Fireworks, high rockets, red lights and green, may, with their glow and spell, bring the spectacle to an impressive close.

After the pageant has been planned from the artistic side, the mechanical organization must next be considered; rehearsals, for instance, advertising, finances, and the preparation of the libretto. As the libretto explains the different episodes, it is

important to the audience and should, therefore, be prepared with care. The public seems especially to enjoy following the printed story of a pageant with the explanatory notes and finds these an aid to the imagination. The episodes should be listed in consecutive order and should have the appropriate titles, mottoes, and accompanying descriptive matter properly attached. Historical incidents, in particular, should be briefly outlined and symbolical dances and events interpreted. Rehearsals and matters of stage direction require systematic attention. Exits and entrances, in particular, should come in quick succession, or preferably, simultaneously; as one scene concludes and the characters leave, another group should appear in the distance, so that the interest never flags. Exits should be comparatively swift and should take place at the right or left of the foreground; entrances should be comparatively slow and made from the distant background. A diagonal entrance, from the rear to the center, is highly effective. To insure smooth and easy transitions, the exits and entrances should be rehearsed separately and repeatedly, after the episode itself has been completed.

Most of these technical matters depend on the pageant master. He, in the end, is the most important person, for he has all the final responsibility. He must be something of a dramatist, a dancing master, an advertising agent, and what not. His publicity campaign must include lectures, circulars, art posters, newspaper and magazine advertising. Through such mediums and through exhibitions of historical pictures and costumes, through city and house decorations, through street banners and parades, the pageant can be made "to revive and maintain the memory of the past, and to arouse and promote civic healthfulness."

Bernard Sobel

Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

POSSIBILITIES IN STATE HISTORICAL CELEBRATIONS

The Indiana historical commission, a non-salaried commission created by the general assembly of 1915, was charged with two duties. Its immediate duty was that of a state centennial commission, and its permanent duty that of the publication of historical material relating to Indiana. The law provided that $5,000, of the total appropriation of $25,000, might be used for publication purposes.

The Indiana historical commission as a centennial commission on an appropriation of $20,000 carried on a state-wide campaign of centennial publicity; it financially assisted in celebrations of state-wide significance; it made possible a state pageant master who could successfully introduce the pageant movement to the educators of our state; it secured as a permanent centennial reminder an artistic centennial medal; it made possible a motion picture of seven reels, depicting the history of the state; it gave an impetus to the study of our state's history and development in clubs and schools; it approved of and assisted in the pioneer mother memorial movement, and it unanimously supported the movement to secure the old capitol at Corydon for a permanent state memorial; it has been responsible for the erection of a large number of centennial memorials over the state. Perhaps its most permanent and far-reaching work has been the inauguration of a permanent state parks movement, which has already resulted in securing as a gift from the people of the state two tracts of real estate which have cost more than twice the amount appropriated for the use of this commission for centennial purposes. On the basis of the appropriation of $5,000 for historical publications, the commission has issued three volumes and has another in press.

In a questionnaire addressed by the commission to the county centennial chairmen, covering the various phases of the year's

work, appeared this question: "What do you consider to have been the most helpful and permanent results of your celebration?" Two closely related facts stand out above all others in the answers: the arousing of a new interest in state and local history, and the creation of a community spirit and consciousness. The two are supplementary to each other and in a word express the vital significance of the celebrational activities of 1916.

From the bluffs of the Ohio to the sand dunes of lake Michigan there has been a general outburst of patriotic interest in Indiana and its history. The schools, as never before, have turned to a consideration of their own commonwealth; club programs have been given the same direction; by city, by township, and by county, facts of local history have been unearthed and rehearsed, both in print and in pageantry; pioneer relics and heirlooms have been rescued from the oblivion of hundreds of attics and displayed to an appreciative public; the state has been fairly dotted with memorial markers; centennial committees have developed into permanent historical societies.

A CAMPAIGN OF CENTENNIAL EDUCATION

When it was organized the immediate problem confronting the commission was one of publicity in the widest sense. The people of Indiana as a whole knew little and therefore cared little about the anniversary and its proper celebration. There was the usual amount of inertia to overcome, the ever-present demands of business life to meet, and an unusually active political campaign with which to compete for the attention of citizens. It was, therefore, no little task to educate and to arouse the state over the comparatively unexciting and unremunerative subject of centennial observance. Many and various were the means applied toward this end.

General bulletins setting forth comprehensively the purpose of the commission and presenting plans for a state-wide celebration were issued for wide distribution. A special bulletin was addressed to the county school superintendents asking their coöperation and pointing out how it might be given. Articles were prepared for newspapers, periodicals, and various news

agencies. Starting in September, 1915, the commission began the publication of a weekly news letter which served as a clearing house of information for the county chairmen and the press of the state. It was published regularly for a little more than a year. Primarily for the children, Miss Dye of the commission edited a department known as "The Centennial Story Hour," in the Sunday edition of the *Indianapolis Star*, in which leading facts of Indiana history were entertainingly told. She also organized the "State-wide Letter Exchange" among the school children, wherein pupils from different parts of the state wrote each other of the interesting things in the history and life of their respective neighborhoods.

Realizing the prime necessity of arousing the interest of the school population as a potent means of publicity, to say nothing of permanent results, the commission made an appeal directly to the teachers through the county institutes of the summer and fall of 1915. In this it had almost the unfailing coöperation of the county superintendents. With a volunteer force consisting chiefly of a half-dozen speakers, for the most part persons connected with the commission, a schedule was arranged by the director whereby practically all the county institutes were addressed in the interest of the centennial observance and of a more thorough study of the state itself.

A large number of addresses were made before clubs, commercial and civic organizations, historical societies, church organizations, and public gatherings of various kinds. The director and assistant director visited many sections of the state in carrying on the work of agitation and organization. While the majority of its meetings were held at the capital, the commission met a few times out in the state for the purpose of arousing interest in different sections and giving encouragement. On such occasions public meetings were generally held, at which speeches were made by members of the commission.

Many patriotic citizens who had no immediate connection with the commission volunteered their services as speakers and were used effectively. In anticipation of the year's demands for speakers in connection with the organization and celebrations, the commission organized a volunteer speakers' bureau. Men

and women throughout the state were called upon to donate their services in this direction, if needed, and almost no declinations were received.

As soon as the work of organizing the state was fairly well accomplished, the director issued a call to the county centennial chairmen to assemble at the capital early in December, for the purpose of discussing the practical problems confronting them in their work. The response was most hearty and encouraging. Busy men and women from all over the state spent the necessary time and money to be present and consider the best interests of Indiana in her centennial year. About fifty chairmen were in attendance and their interchange of ideas and plans was most helpful, exerting a profound influence on the work throughout the state. At this problem conference such subjects as county organization, finance, celebrational features, pageantry, home-coming, coöperation with the schools, permanent memorials, gathering historical materials, and publicity, were discussed.

For the purpose of giving added impetus to the preparations, and of calling attention to the industrial resources of the state, the secretaries of the commercial bodies of Indiana, at the state meeting in January, in conjunction with the director of the commission, set apart February 22, as a rallying point for centennial enthusiasm; and the governor issued a proclamation designating the day as "Indiana Products Day." On this patriotic date centennial banquets and dinners were held in many towns and cities, at which nothing but foods grown or manufactured in the state were served. Attention was thus called in a striking manner to our material resources, and an effective means was given whereby, in the after-dinner programs, interest and enthusiasm in the centennial program for the state might be aroused. The Indiana products day movement was organized and carried out by the commission.

Another effective means of obtaining publicity was that of the state park movement, launched and carried on under the auspices of the commission. The park campaign attracted wide notice and directed attention to the centennial propaganda of which it was a part.

George Ade, chairman of the state committee on home-coming,

did a valuable piece of work in advertising the centennial without, as well as within, Indiana. He compiled a unique series of Hoosierly greetings and invitations, contributed by Governor Ralston, Vice-president Marshall, ex-Vice-president Fairbanks, and by a galaxy of Indiana literary celebrities, which was published by the Bobbs-Merrill company as "An Invitation to You and Your Folks, from Jim and Some More of the Home Folks." This was widely distributed. The arrangement of a set of lantern slides illustrating the historical development of Indiana was found to be of educational value. These slides were circulated among schools and clubs of the state and have been in continuous use. They were provided by the commission but handled by the department of history and archives of the state library. In this connection it should be said that the state library coöperated heartily with the commission in its educative activities, particularly in the issue of bulletins which ably supplemented the commission's publications.

Under the general head of publicity and education there should be mentioned the promotion of the moving picture, "Indiana." The dramatization of the history of the state in the "movie" appealed strongly to the commission as a popular and impressive means of education, but it was evident that the commission was in no position to handle directly so big a project, and that the enterprise, if it should materialize, would have to be promoted as a business venture by private capital. A company, known as the Inter-state historical pictures corporation, which contracted with the commission to operate under its auspices and sanction, was formed by Indiana citizens. The corporation commissioned the Selig polyscope company of Chicago to produce the picture, on the basis of a scenario approved by the commission. Work was begun in the spring, and a seven-reel film was completed about the first of June. Owing to a combination of a late start and inclement weather, the picture was produced under somewhat unfavorable circumstances, causing some otherwise needless imperfections, but, on the whole, it presented a suitable and commendable picture show, suggestive of incidents in the historical life of Indiana.

In conclusion it must be stated that the newspapers throughout the state were naturally an important factor in whatever

success the commission achieved in carrying its message to the people. For the most part they manifested a patriotic and progressive interest in the cause, in the aid of which many were most generous.

CELEBRATIONS

With but $20,000 at its disposal for celebrational activities, the commission faced a difficult problem. Such ambitious projects as those of centennial expositions and great central celebrations as had been carried out in other states, were manifestly out of the question. Moreover, the members were doubtful as to the desirability of such forms of observance, had they been possible. Their great concern was that the commemoration of our centenary might be such that it would reach the people throughout the entire state, quickening in them a renewed loyalty and a deeper sense of civic responsibility.

Actuated, therefore, by a wisely selected purpose as well as by financial necessity, the Indiana historical commission blazed the way to a new scheme of observance. In thorough keeping with our democratic institutions and political organization, it decided to decentralize the Indiana celebration, making it state-wide and of genuine interest to the people. It determined to make the anniversary mean as much in the extreme corner of the "pocket" as in the capital itself. With this end in view a campaign was vigorously undertaken in behalf of a state-wide celebration, twofold in its significance; historical, in the knowledge and appreciation of the state and its institutions, present as well as past; patriotic, in a new admiration and love for the Indiana that is and may be. In a word the commission went to the whole people of Indiana with this challenge: "This anniversary is an occasion for taking stock of our history, local as well as state, and of paying due tribute to the builders of the commonwealth. It is a patriotic service for hamlet and town and city. We may show thereby whether we appreciate and whether we are worthy of the deeds of our forefathers. It is our celebration, as a people, to make of it what we will." This is the Indiana experiment which has been watched with much interest by other states that are soon to observe their own centenaries.

Careful planning was necessary to insure a general observance, so the commission began organizing the state on the basis of the county. Centennial chairmen were secured in the various counties, each to select his own committee for the planning and execution of the work. Men and women from all walks of life accepted these posts of responsibility in the spirit of rendering a real public service, without hope of reward. In all but two or three counties, leaders were thus secured. With a few the leadership was nominal only, but the majority took up their work energetically and patriotically, several achieving results truly remarkable. On the whole it may be said that satisfactory work was done in most of the counties and that reasonably satisfactory results were obtained in from three-fourths to four-fifths of them. There were probably not a dozen counties in which some kind of celebration was not held.

The general schedule provided for the holding of local and school celebrations early in the spring. Many county school superintendents coöperated by setting apart one day of observance throughout the schools of their counties. This did much to prepare the way for the later celebrations, participated in more generally, beginning early in the summer and running well into the autumn. The greater number of the latter were county-wide in scope.

These county celebrations varied greatly in length, in content, and in the spirit which pervaded them. Some were for a day, others continued two or three days, and yet others for a week. As a whole they consisted of home-comings and reunions, historical and inspirational addresses and sermons, musical festivals and old melody concerts, exhibits of pioneer relics, industrial and agricultural displays, historical drama-pageants, folk dances, school drills, reproductions of pioneer life, centennial parades, and exercises in connection with the dedication of permanent memorials. A feature of not a few of these was the presentation of the moving picture, "Indiana." The commission did its utmost to see that these programs were strictly patriotic and centennial in nature, and such were the greater number. In some counties the observance was conducted in connection with chautauquas, industrial fairs, and county festivals, and in a few the centennial idea was prostituted for commercial

considerations. On the whole, however, it is felt by the commission that its plan for a state-wide celebration was realized both in scope and in spirit to a remarkable degree, considering the limited amount of funds at hand, and the short time for preparation. It has been a distinctive and impressive sight to see the great array of counties, following fast one after another, each making its own contribution to the centennial year, paying its own tribute to the state of which it is an integral part.

Two celebrations, however, were more than county and more than regional—those held at Indiana's two capitals, Corydon and Indianapolis, and they accordingly stood out from the others as state celebrations. The former, staged for two days, June 2 and 3, around the old Harrison county court house, the first capitol, and beneath the constitutional elm, portrayed vividly the beginnings of statehood. The latter, of two weeks' duration, October 2 to 15, at the present capital, depicted by means of a pageant and otherwise, the wonderful development of Indiana during the past century.

The commission feels that this decentralized observance, unique in the history of state centennial celebrations, has been of incalculable influence and significance. The centennial propaganda has been carried to the four corners of the state, and we have had the inspiring spectacle of a people of a commonwealth delighting to do it honor and reverence. A much more intimate and appreciative knowledge of the history of Indiana has resulted, together with a far better acquaintance with the present facts about the state, its geography, its people, its resources, and its possibilities. This bespeaks a greater and a more intelligent loyalty — the basis of a higher type of citizenship. The fact that the people as a whole in the various communities have united and coöperated in a way hitherto unknown means that in many cases a new community consciousness has been developed. Out of it all, likewise, has come a more perfect state consciousness which augurs well for Indiana, on the threshold of her second centenary.

PAGEANTRY

Two years ago he who spoke to Hoosiers of pageantry, spoke in an unknown tongue. The word was vaguely associated with those old worthies, "the boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,"

"magnificent spectacle," and "fanfare of trumpets," but was popularly synonomous with our old friend, tried and true, the "peerade." Today we laugh at such gross ignorance, for the centennial has made "pageant" one of the commonest of Hoosier household words, the pronunciation of which is the shibboleth, dividing the centennial elect from the medievalists.

When discussion as to ways and means of observing our anniversary became general, this old, though distant, acquaintance made its appearance, but in new clothing. In order to give it a proper and somewhat formal introduction, the state university brought William Chauncy Langdon of New York to Bloomington to give a course at the summer session of 1915 on the general subject of pageantry. It should be noted that the university had just issued a comprehensive bulletin on the subject by Dr. Withington of its English department. Through these and other agencies, the general content, scope, and purpose of the dramatic portrait of the community, past and present — a mirror in which the community sees itself as it has been, is, and as it may be — became familiar to people in country and town alike. The possibilities of pageantry appealed strongly to the commission as a means of drawing attention to Indiana history and of providing a form of observance which would draw whole communities together in a better understanding and appreciation of the history of their own neighborhood in relation to that of their state. It decided, therefore, to feature the pageant in such celebrations as should come more directly under its own auspices.

But pageantry as a real community effort and expression is a recent development, and there was felt the need of having some one with experience to "cut the pattern" for Indiana. The commission, therefore, in conjunction with and by means of the financial help of the university and Mr. Hugh McK. Landon, secured the services of Mr. Langdon, the first president of the American pageant association, as state pageant master. The duties involved on his part were primarily the writing and directing of three pageants: one at the university, one at Corydon, and one at Indianapolis. At the same time the commission carried on a campaign of education throughout the state, by means of bulletins, its weekly news letter, and lectures, with

the purpose of impressing the people generally with the possibilities of the pageant as an agency of centennial observance. Effective work in this direction was done by Miss Charity Dye who had written the New Harmony pageant two years before. She traveled extensively over the state and was also the author of a very helpful bulletin, "Pageant suggestions for the Indiana statehood centennial celebration," published and distributed by the commission.

In these ways the leaven was provided and an interest was soon manifest. The first fruitage of all this propaganda was the university pageant at Bloomington, or more properly speaking, the Bloomington pageant. In a large sense it was what it was intended to be, a laboratory pageant, an object lesson to the people of Indiana. After having read and studied about pageantry, interested persons from far and near went to Bloomington to see and study at first hand.

One striking and significant development in the work should be noted. In the early stages of preparation the one great problem which presented itself to the various communities was that of authorship and direction. It was so serious that for a time it seemed probable that relatively few pageants would be attempted. Professional pageant masters were not at hand and imported ones constituted a luxury that few places could afford, even had they been available. But Hoosiers are nothing if not resourceful and versatile, particularly when a pad and pencil are involved. In short they were quick to "catch on," with the result that pageant writing was soon in progress by the home product route, from the Ohio northward. In all, some forty-five pageants were presented in 1916, and aside from those over which Mr. Langdon had control, all but about a half-dozen were written and directed by home talent. In some cases the results were somewhat crude to be sure, but they were the expression of the community. In other cases the "made in Indiana" pageants compared very favorably indeed with any given in the state. As an indication of the scope of the movement it is estimated that 250,000 citizens saw at least one pageant during the year, and that from 30,000 to 40,000 people participated in one of them.

For the most part these pageants, while presenting the broad

outlines of the history of the state as a whole, at the same time depicted the history of the more immediate neighborhoods in which they were given. In this way the local history of a very considerable part of the commonwealth was dramatized, since the geographical distribution of the pageants was rather surprisingly uniform, although the pageant area *par excellence* was that of the "pocket," the southwestern section of Indiana.

The most difficult problem, but the one in which the possibilities were greatest, was that of the county pageant in which parts were taken by the respective townships. It was a problem in unity and organization, but where successfully solved, the results achieved in bringing the whole county together as an organic community were in proportion to the difficulties overcome.

The commission considers this an excellent showing for one year's work, the merits of which are evident. By thus visualizing the past, its events were made more intelligible and interesting. As nothing else has done, the pageant brought all classes of a community together with a common purpose. Indeed whole counties were drawn together and old rivalries forgotten in a closer acquaintanceship and a better understanding. Moreover all was done in the name of Indiana, for which a deeper devotion was inspired.

In conclusion I would say, beware of commercialized patriotism; eliminate the street fair and carnival idea; do not make your organization too complex; do not attempt too many things; get a man with a newspaper pen but with historic instinct to handle publicity; send a good organizer over the state, into every county, to find local leaders who may be depended on; and localize rather than centralize your celebrational activities.

Harlow Lindley

Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana

SPANISH INFLUENCE IN THE WEST DURING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

By James A. James, *Northwestern University*

[Printed in the *Mississippi valley historical review* for September, 1917.]

THE PENNSYLVANIA BRIBERY BILL OF 1836

By Reginald C. McGrane, *University of Cincinnati*

[Incorporated in the author's *The crisis of 1837 and the subtreasury bill* (in press).]

SECTIONALISM IN KENTUCKY FROM 1855 TO 1865

By James R. Robertson, *Berea College*

[Printed in the *Mississippi valley historical review* for June, 1917.]

GLIMPSES OF SOME OLD MISSISSIPPI RIVER POSTS

By Louis Pelzer, *Iowa State University*

[Incorporated in the author's *Marches of the dragoons in the Mississippi valley* (State historical society of Iowa, Iowa City, 1917).]

THE MILITARY-INDIAN FRONTIER, 1830-1835

By Ruth A. Gallaher, *Iowa State University*

[Printed in the *Iowa journal of history and politics* for July, 1917.]

THE RISE OF SPORTS, 1876-1893

By Frederic L. Paxson, *University of Wisconsin*

[Printed in the *Mississippi valley historical review* for September, 1917.]

THE BOUND TO PLEASE
Heckman Bindery INC.